

OPAF: Optimized Secure Two-Party Computation Protocols for Nonlinear Activation Functions in Recurrent Neural Network

Qian Feng, Zhihua Xia, *Member, IEEE*, Zhifeng Xu, Jiasi Weng, and Jian Weng, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Deep neural network (DNN) typically involves convolutions, pooling, and activation function. Due to the growing concern about privacy, privacy-preserving DNN becomes a hot research topic. Generally, the convolution and pooling operations can be supported by additive homomorphic and secure comparison, but the secure implementation of activation functions is not so straightforward for the requirements of accuracy and efficiency, especially for the non-linear ones such as exponential, sigmoid, and tanh functions. This paper pays a special attention to the implementation of such non-linear functions in semi-honest model with two-party settings, for which SIRNN is the current state-of-the-art. Different from previous works, we proposed improved implementations for these functions by using their intrinsic features as well as worthy tiny tricks. At first, we propose a novel and efficient protocol for exponential function by using a divide-and-conquer strategy with most of the computations executed locally. Exponential protocol is widely used in machine learning tasks such as Poisson regression, and is also a key component of sigmoid and tanh functions. Next, we take advantage of the symmetry of sigmoid and Tanh, and fine-tune the inputs to reduce the 2PC building blocks, which helps to save overhead and improve performance. As a result, we implement these functions with fewer fundamental building blocks. The comprehensive evaluations show that our protocols achieve state-of-the-art precision while reducing run-time by approximately 57%, 44%, and 42% for exponential (with only negative inputs), sigmoid, and Tanh functions, respectively.

Index Terms—privacy-preserving, secret sharing, non-linear functions, RNN.

I. INTRODUCTION

ARTIFICIAL Intelligence (AI) is rapidly evolving in recent years and being used in a variety of fields, including health care, finance, manufacturing, and beyond. AI requires large amounts of data for learning, and as AI continues to evolve, numerous privacy problems related to it aroused widespread concern. European Union has set up the General Data Privacy Regulation [1], which specifies that the utilization of personal data requires the consent of the data subject. Also it has motivated the development of privacy-preserving DNN training and inference.

The seminal work of SecureML [2] demonstrated that privacy-preserving inference and training of DNN can be resolved by secure two-party computation (2PC). 2PC [3], [4] allows the two parties, P_1 and P_2 , to interactively compute

an agreed function f on their sensitive inputs x and y , with strong guarantees that the interaction discloses no information about the sensitive inputs. There has recently been a surge of 2PC-based works for privacy-preserving DNN inference [5]–[12]. Despite the awesome efforts, there remains a significant gap from privacy-preserving machine learning to practical applications for performance. Also, the 2PC secure inference protocols that support complex neural networks effectively and efficiently stand as an open problem. As exhibited in Table I, a multitude of existing works are suffering from a wide range of deficiencies. CryptFlow2 [7] and Cheetah [11] have achieved great success in privacy-preserving CNN inference (e.g., ResNet [13], DenseNet [14], and MobileNet [15]) through 2PC. However, these networks only involve simple nonlinear functions such as ReLU and Maxpool.

With the rising of ChatGPT, a popular language model that generates human-like responses in natural language conversations, the spotlight has once again been turned towards Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs). RNNs are neural networks that can process sequential or time series data and are commonly used for natural language processing tasks such as speech recognition and machine translation. These networks extensively use nonlinear activation functions that are more complex, such as exponential, sigmoid, and Tanh functions. Unfortunately only a few works have provided secure implementations of these nonlinear functions [2], [5], [16], and those works are still not satisfactory.

The demands above drive us to further optimize the 2PC protocols for nonlinear activation functions. The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel 2PC implementation for exponential function using a divide-and-conquer strategy with most of the computations executed in local. The proposed protocol requires only a constant number of rounds and low communication in high-precision fixed-point operations. It provides an efficiency building block for the 2PC implementation of sigmoid and Tanh.
- We improve the existing realizations of sigmoid and Tanh from [10] by reducing 2PC building blocks through the symmetry of functions. In addition, we further reduce the building blocks by fine-tuning the encoding of $-x$ (with $x \geq 0$). These save cost and runtime in both respects.
- Finally, we conducted a comprehensive evaluation to our secure exponential, sigmoid, and Tanh functions. In addition, we also open our secure sigmoid and Tanh

Qian Feng, Zhihua Xia, Zhifeng Xu, Jiasi Weng and Jian Weng are with the Department of College of Cyberspace Security, Jinan University, Guangzhou, 510632, China.

Zhihua Xia is the corresponding author. e-mail: xia_zhihua@163.com.

TABLE I

SOME RELATED WORKS. RNN REPRESENTS WHETHER THE WORK SUPPORTS RECURRENT NEURAL NETWORK STRUCTURE AND ☆ REPRESENTS THE BASELINE.

Work	RNN	Run-time			Communication traffic			Max Errors		
		sigmoid	Tanh	exp	sigmoid	Tanh	exp	sigmoid	Tanh	exp
SIRNN [10]	✓	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆
MiniONN [5] 12-piece	✓	☆×34	-	-	☆×19	-	-	☆×34	-	-
MiniONN [5] 48-piece	✓	☆×115	-	-	☆×70	-	-	☆	-	-
MP-SPDZ [16]	-	☆×89	-	☆×70	☆×201	-	☆×70	☆	-	☆×70
CryptFlow2 [7]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	-
Cheetah [11]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Ours	✓	☆×56%	☆×58%	☆×43%	☆×64%	☆×60%	☆×59%	☆×33%	☆	☆

protocol to an entire process of RNN inference, which further demonstrates our improvements.

II. RELATED WORKS

Secure Multiparty Computation (MPC) is a computer security technology that allows multiple participants to jointly compute a function without revealing their inputs to each other, only disclosing the computed result. MPC is often modeled as a Boolean circuit [4], [17], [18] or an arithmetic circuit [2], [5], [7], [9]–[11], [16], [19], and can be implemented through two different routes: the secret sharing and the garbled circuit routes. The secret sharing route requires interaction among the parties for each nonlinear gate of the circuit, resulting in lower communication bandwidth but with the loop count linearly related to the circuit depth. The garbled circuit route involves each party constructing an encrypted version of the circuit, allowing only one computation and resulting in higher communication bandwidth but a constant number of rounds. In the past, secret sharing was more suitable for linear operations, while garbled circuits were more suitable for nonlinear operations. ABY [20] proposed the conversion between Boolean and arithmetic circuits to improve overall performance.

In recent years, with the rapid development of privacy-preserving machine learning, arithmetic secret sharing-based semi-honest 2PC non-linear computation has achieved a historic breakthrough [2], [5], [7], [9]–[11], [16], [19]. The performance of many non-linear activation functions widely used in neural networks has surpassed that of garbled circuits in secret sharing methods.

Non-linear function computation based on arithmetic secret sharing is mainly divided into two technical routes: (1) ad hoc piecewise linear approximation route represented in SecureML [2], ABY2.0 [9] and MiniONN [5], and (2) general MPC routes based on protocol combinations, which is represented by MP-SPDZ [16] and SIRNN [10]. The use of piecewise linear approximations requires developer intervention for each dataset and each model to balance accuracy and latency, which might be unacceptable in the context of automated frameworks for secure inference. Additionally, these methods rely on 2PC building blocks from [16], [20], [21] and suffer from huge performance overheads. SecureML [2] and ABY2.0 [9] use a simple three-piece linear approximation of sigmoid. This simple implementation has a

whopping error that greatly affects the accuracy of inference and training. MiniONN [5] indicated that this approximation causes the cross-entropy loss to diverge to infinity. It uses a 12-piece spline approximation, and achieves smaller errors than SecureML and ABY2.0 at a higher cost, so as to meet the requirements of cross-entropy loss. Recently, Fan et al. [19] propose a non-linear function code generator (NFGGen) for evaluating nonlinear functions on a general MPC platform. They use m -piecewise polynomials with a maximum degree of k to approximate each non-linear function, and propose an algorithm for automatically determining k and m . Their scheme results in positive improvements on some nonlinear functions, however, it achieves no improvement on sigmoid compared to [16].

As a general MPC protocol, [16] computes sigmoid = $\frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$ in three steps. First, the exponent is approximated with a Taylor series polynomial. Then, $1 + e^{-x}$ in secret sharing can be computed locally. Finally, the result of sigmoid is obtained by using a secure computation protocol for computing the reciprocal of $1 + e^{-x}$. Most existing secure reciprocal computation algorithms are based on iterative algorithms such as Newton-Raphson’s method [22], [23] and Goldschmidt’s algorithms [24], [25]. These algorithms can securely compute the reciprocal of a number v . If α is known such that $2^\alpha \leq v < 2^{\alpha+1}$, the iteration process can be started directly, otherwise α needs to be securely computed at first, which incurs huge overhead. In addition, [16] requires high-degree Taylor series polynomials to accurately approximate the exponential function, which also incurs huge overhead.

The state-of-the-art 2PC work, SIRNN [10], revealed that α corresponding to $1 + e^{-x}$ is always 0 when $x > 0$; thus α does not need to be computed securely and the reciprocal of $1 + e^{-x}$ can be directly calculated. Similarly, when $x < 0$, we have sigmoid(x) = $e^x \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^x}$ and the α corresponding to $1 + e^x$ is always 0, in which it is also not needed to compute α . Finally, it is obvious that sigmoid(x) = 0.5 for $x = 0$. Based on this finding, SIRNN represents the sigmoid function as a piecewise function:

$$\text{sigmoid}(x) = \begin{cases} 0.5, & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}, & \text{if } x > 0, \\ e^x \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^x}, & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$$

which avoids computing α in secure multiparty scenarios and greatly reduces the overhead of sigmoid. The Tanh function

and the sigmoid function are closely related [26]: $\text{Tanh}(x) = 2 \cdot \text{sigmoid}(2x) - 1$. Therefore, the 2PC implementation of Tanh can be achieved by secure sigmoid. However, as pointed out in [12], the functionalities provided in SIRNN are highly sequential and would lead to a large number of rounds in the online phase. Nevertheless, SIRNN is still the state-of-the-art work for 2PC sigmoid and Tanh. In this work we significantly reduced the number of rounds and online phases of SIRNN.

SIRNN also proposed a secure protocol for the exponential function that receives negative inputs by using lookup tables [27]. When the length of input is small (e.g., ≤ 8 bits), this method can achieve excellent efficiency and accuracy. However, the cost of lookup tables grows exponentially with the length of input. To overcome this obstacle, SIRNN has made some optimizations to their exponential protocol. Specifically, a long secret input is securely decomposed into multiple short secret inputs. Then, the exponential results of multiple short inputs are calculated separately, and all results from the previous step are multiplied together using a multiplication protocol to obtain the final output. While these optimizations somewhat suppress the problem of the overhead explosion, the secure decomposition of secret inputs and multiplication operations still introduce a significant overhead which cannot be ignored.

Summary. Only a few works have provided 2PC implementations for non-linear functions such as exponential, sigmoid and Tanh. Among them, SIRNN’s implementations [10] are state-of-the-art currently available. However, their 2PC implementation for exponential is based on a lookup table route with extensive communications. And their 2PC implementations for sigmoid and Tanh fail to take the advantage of the symmetry in these functions to save more costs (more details are available in Section IV-C).

III. PRELIMINARIES

We define the expected notations, the 2PC building blocks from existing works, and the threat model we against. As with most practical MPC platforms, we use *fixed-point* arithmetics instead of the commonly used *floating-point* arithmetics for efficiency. Accordingly, it is crucial to first encode the *floating-point* or *real* number in the plaintext environment into its corresponding *fixed-point* representations. Our encoding details are defined in Section III-A. Second, it is extremely vital to accurately evaluate the gap between the results on fixed-points and those on floating-points. In this paper, we use *ULP* (units in last place) errors to report the precision of our implementations. The details of the ulp error are defined in Section III-B. Additionally, our implementation is based on the secret sharing technique, and it is defined in Section III-C. Our implementations are defend against static semi-honest adversaries running in a probabilistic polynomial (PPT), which we present in Section III-D and they use 2PC building blocks from existing work in Section III-E. Finally, let λ denote the computational security parameter, which is set to 128 by default.

A. Fixed-Point Representation

In *fixed-point* arithmetic, a float number $x_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is (approximately) represented using an l -bit integer x as,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \text{Fix}(x_f, s) \\ &= \lfloor x_f \cdot 2^s \rfloor \text{ mod } L, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $L = 2^l$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}_L$, l denotes the bitwidth, and $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the scale indicating the fractional part of bitwidth. For easy representation, we define an indicator function $1\{b\}$ that returns 1 when b is true, and 0 otherwise. Furthermore, we define $\text{msb}(x)$ to calculate the most important bit of a fixed-point number x as

$$\text{msb}(x) = 1\{x \geq 2^{l-1}\}, \quad (2)$$

define $\text{sfp}(x)$ to transform the number $x \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ to be a signed-fixed-point number as

$$\text{sfp}(x) = x - \text{msb}(x) \cdot L. \quad (3)$$

Then, the reverse mapping from fixed-point number x to float-point representation can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} x'_f &= \text{rev}(x), \\ &= \text{sfp}(x)/2^s, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the division is operated over \mathbb{R} .

B. ULP Errors

It is impractical to precisely represent an irrational value using a finite number of bits. As a result, finding a way to quantify the biases between an exact real result and the output of a math library with a finite bit representation is critical. Various error concepts can be used – absolute error, relative error and ULP error. Standard math libraries utilize ULP error as a standard to evaluate whether the real output of a math function is close enough to the finite-bit output produced by the library [28]. The precision and accuracy of the realization of that math function increase as the ULP value decreases. At a high level, ULP error between an exact real result r and the output res of secure computation is equal to the number of representable numbers between r and res [10].

C. Secret Sharing

We use 2-out-of-2 secret sharing protocol over different power-of-2 rings to construct our new protocols as in [10]. Assuming there are two parties P_1 and P_2 . For additive sharing, given a fixed-point number $x \in \mathbb{Z}_L$, it generates a random number denoted as $[x]_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ for P_1 , and then calculates $[x]_2 = x - [x]_1 \text{ mod } L$ for P_2 . We define a function $\text{wrap}([x]_1, [x]_2, L)$ to judge if $[x]_1 + [x]_2$ is out of the range of \mathbb{Z}_L as

$$\text{wrap}([x]_1, [x]_2, L) = 1\{[x]_1 + [x]_2 \geq L\}. \quad (5)$$

Accordingly, a reconstruction of x can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 x &= \text{Reconst}([x]_1, [x]_2) \\
 &= [x]_1 + [x]_2 \bmod L, \\
 &= [x]_1 + [x]_2 - \text{wrap}(x) \cdot L.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For boolean sharing, given a bit x , it generates a random bit denoted as $\langle x \rangle_1$ for P_1 , and then calculates $\langle x \rangle_2 = \langle x \rangle_1 \oplus x$ for P_2 . Accordingly, the reconstruction of x can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 x &= \text{Reconst}(\langle x \rangle_1, \langle x \rangle_2) \\
 &= \langle x \rangle_1 \oplus \langle x \rangle_2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

D. 2PC and Threat Model

2PC. Secure 2-party computation (2PC) [3], [4] allows two parties, P_1 and P_2 , to compute an agreed function f on their sensitive inputs x and y . It provides an interactive protocol with strong guarantees that the interaction discloses no information about the sensitive inputs apart from what can be inferred from the output. A typical approach to 2PC starts with the parties secretly sharing their inputs with each other and running a protocol that uses the shares of (x, y) to securely generate the shares of $f(x, y)$. Then, the parties exchange the shares of the output and reconstruct the output.

Threat Model. Our threat model is the same as SIRNN [10] and considers a static semi-honest adversary running in probabilistic polynomial time (PPT). Briefly, there is a computationally constrained adversary \mathcal{A} that takes over one of the parties at the beginning of the protocol execution, which conforms to the protocol specification but tries to learn additional information about the honest party's input. We argue for the security against this adversary in the standard simulation paradigm [3], [29], [30], which demonstrates the indistinguishability of the adversary's views in the real and ideal executions in the case where a trusted third party receives the inputs and provides the functional outputs alone. For a real function f to be calculated, consider the following two interactions: real interaction, in which P_1 and P_2 interact using the protocol specification in the presence of \mathcal{A} and the environment \mathcal{Z} , and ideal interaction, in which P_1 and P_2 send their inputs to a trusted function \mathcal{F} that computes f and return the outputs to parties. We believe that for every real adversary \mathcal{A} , there is an ideal adversary \mathcal{S} , so the environment \mathcal{Z} interacting with the adversary cannot distinguish between real and ideal interactions. Our protocol calls for several sub-protocols. For ease of description, we use a hybrid model to describe them. This is the same as the actual interaction, except that the execution of the sub-protocols is replaced by the calls to the corresponding trusted functions - it is said that the protocol calling \mathcal{F} is in the \mathcal{F} -hybrid model.

E. 2PC Functionalities

For a 2-party computation functionality \mathcal{F} , we say “ P_1 and P_2 invoke $\mathcal{F}(x)$ to learn y ” to mean that P_1 with input $[x]_1$ and P_2 with input $[x]_2$ invoke \mathcal{F} and learn additive shares of y , i.e., P_1 gets $[y]_1$ and P_2 gets $[y]_2$. In our protocols, we use the following 2-party computation functionalities.

- \mathcal{F}_{msb} takes $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ as inputs, and outputs $\langle \text{msb}(x) \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$, with $\text{msb}(x) = \text{Reconst}(\langle \text{msb}(x) \rangle_1,$

$\langle \text{msb}(x) \rangle_2)$. It can be realized as in [10] with communication less than $\lambda l + 14l$ bits.

- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbToWrap}}$ takes $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ and $\langle \text{msb}(x) \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$ as inputs, and outputs $\langle \text{wrap}(x) \rangle_i$, with $\text{wrap}(x) = \text{Reconst}(\langle \text{wrap}(x) \rangle_1, \langle \text{wrap}(x) \rangle_2)$. It can be realized by [10] with $\lambda + 2$ bits of total communication.
- \mathcal{F}_{Mux} takes $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ and $\langle b \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$ as inputs, and outputs $[y]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$, with $y = (b) ? x : 0$. \mathcal{F}_{Mux} can be realized as in [7] with $2(\lambda + 2l)$ bits of total communication. [10] provide an optimized protocol that reduces communication from $2(\lambda + 2l)$ to $2(\lambda + l)$.
- \mathcal{F}_{AND} takes $\langle x \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\langle y \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$ as input, and returns $\langle z \rangle_i \in \{0, 1\}$ with $z = x \& y$. It can be realized using Beaver bit-triples [7], [31] with $\lambda + 20$ or 148 bits of total communication.
- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$ takes $[x]_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^m}$ and $[x]_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ as inputs, and outputs $[y]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ such that $y = [x]_1 \times [x]_2$. It can be realized as in [10] with $\mu(\lambda + \mu/2 + 1/2) + mn$ bits of total communication where $\mu = \min(m, n)$.
- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Mult}}$ takes $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^m}$ and $[y]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ as inputs, and outputs $[z]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ where $z = x \cdot y$ for $l = m + n$. It can be realized as in [10] with $\lambda(2\mu + 6) + 2\mu\nu + \mu^2 + 3\mu + 2\nu + 4$ bits of total communication where $\mu = \min(m, n), \nu = \max(m, n)$.
- \mathcal{F}_{B2A} takes $\langle x \rangle_i$ as input and outputs arithmetic shares of the same value, i.e., $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$. It can be realized as in [7] with $\lambda + l$ bits of total communication.
- \mathcal{F}_{TR} takes $[x]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ as inputs, and outputs $[y]_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^l-s}$ such that $y = \lfloor x/2^s \rfloor$. \mathcal{F}_{TR} can be realized as in [10] with $\lambda(s + 1) + l + 13s$ bits of total communication.
- \mathcal{F}_{Rec} takes $[x]_i$ as input, and outputs $\text{Fix}(\frac{1}{\text{rev}(x)}, s)_i$. Note that \mathcal{F}_{Rec} requires the input $\text{rev}(x) \in [1, 2)$. \mathcal{F}_{Rec} has been realized in [10].

IV. THE PROPOSED 2PC PROTOCOLS

In this section, we present our proposed exponential, sigmoid, and tanh protocols in detail, and analyze the security of the protocols. Our protocols are built on the basis of the existing 2PC functionalities described in subsection III-E.

A. Exponential Function

The first protocol we proposed is a secure two-party computation for exponential function. It takes secret fixed-point numbers as input, and outputs secret fixed-point results for the function, which we denote as \mathcal{F}_{exp} . As explained in Section III-C, we use 2-out-of-2 additive secret sharing. The secret input x is split into two secret shares $[x]_1$ and $[x]_2$ held by P_1 and P_2 , respectively. The intention of P_i is to obtain the secret result of $\text{Fix}(e^{\text{rev}(x)}, s)$ without revealing any information about its $[x]_i$.

Motivation. SIRNN built a secure 2-PC protocol for exponential function by constructing the look-up tables for all items of $e^x, x \in \mathbb{Z}_L$. Then the required item is securely transmitted by oblivious transfer (OT). It achieves state-of-the art efficiency. Xia et al. proposed a secure 2-PC protocol for exponential function in infinite domain [32]. They designed the protocols to switch the additive and multiplicative shares, and used the

TABLE II
THE ASSOCIATION FROM WRAP AND MSB TO x'_f AND $e^{x'_f}$.

wrap	msb	x'_f	$e^{x'_f}$
1	1	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}}$
1	0	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}}$
0	1	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}}$
0	0	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}}$

following property of exponential function to construct the secure protocols,

$$e^{a+b} = e^a \cdot e^b. \quad (8)$$

The protocol in [32] is efficient but cannot be securely implemented in finite domain. Inspired by [32], we design a secure 2-PC protocol for exponential function using the property in Eq.(8).

Design. Different from previous works, we designed an improved protocol to securely implement the exponential function by using divide-and-conquer strategy. Recalling Eqs. (3), (4), and (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x'_f &= \text{rev}(x) = \text{sfp}(x)/2^s \\ &= (x - \text{msb}(x) \cdot L)/2^s \\ &= ([x]_1 + [x]_2 - \text{wrap}(x) \cdot L - \text{msb}(x) \cdot L)/2^s. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We list all possible cases of x'_f and $e^{x'_f}$ in Table II, and deal with each case separately. For simplification, we write **wrap** and **msb** for $\text{wrap}(x)$ and $\text{msb}(x)$, respectively.

Then, Eq. (9) can be expressed as a segment function according to Table II,

$$x'_f = \text{rev}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}, & \text{if } \text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb} = 1 \\ \frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}, & \text{if } \text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb} = 1 \\ \frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Then, we can calculate $e^{x'_f}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} e^{x'_f} &= e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}} \cdot (\text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb}) \\ &+ e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}} \cdot (\text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb}) \\ &+ e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}} \cdot (\text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb} \ \oplus \ \text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb} \ \oplus \ 1), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which can be further transformed to be

$$\begin{aligned} e^{x'_f} &= (e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}} - e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}}) \cdot (\text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb}) \\ &+ (e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}} - e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}}) \cdot (\text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb}) \\ &+ e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In 2PC scenario, **msb** and **wrap** can be calculated by \mathcal{F}_{msb} and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOWrap}}$, operation $\&$ can be calculated by \mathcal{F}_{AND} , and operation \oplus between boolean shares can be performed locally without any communication. And based on the mathematical

Algorithm 1 Exponential protocol \mathcal{F}_{exp}

Input: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i holds $[x]_i$.

Output: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i learns $[y]_i$.

1: P_i sets:

$$a_i = \text{Fix}(e^{\frac{[x]_i}{2^s}}, s'),$$

$$b_i = \text{Fix}(e^{\frac{[x]_i - L/2}{2^s}}, s'),$$

$c_i = \text{Fix}(e^{\frac{[x]_i - L}{2^s}}, s')$, where $s' > s$ and will be discussed in Section VI-A.

2: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$ with inputs a_i, b_i, c_i to learn $[a']_i, [b']_i, [c']_i$ with $a' = a_1 \times a_2$, $b' = b_1 \times b_2$, and $c' = c_1 \times c_2$.

3: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{msb} with input $[x]_i$ to learn output $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$.

4: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOWrap}}$ with inputs $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$ and $[x]_i$ to learn $\langle \text{wrap} \rangle_i$.

5: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{AND} with inputs $\langle \text{wrap} \rangle_i$ and $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$ to learn output $\langle \text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb} \rangle_i$.

6: P_i sets:

$$\langle \text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb} \rangle_i = \langle \text{msb} \rangle_i \oplus \langle \text{wrap} \rangle_i,$$

$$[b' - a']_i = [b']_i - [a']_i \text{ mod } N,$$

$[c' - a']_i = [c']_i - [a']_i \text{ mod } N$, where $N \geq L$ and will be discussed in Section V.

7: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Mux} with inputs $[b' - a']_i$ and $[\text{wrap} \ \oplus \ \text{msb}]_i$ to learn $[t1]_i$.

8: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Mux} with inputs $[c' - a']_i$ and $[\text{wrap} \ \& \ \text{msb}]_i$ to learn $[t2]_i$.

9: P_i sets $[rst]_i = [t1]_i + [t2]_i + [a']_i \text{ mod } N$.

10: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{TR} with inputs $[rst]_i$ and common parameter $2s' - s$ to learn final output $[y]_i$.

properties of exponential functions, we next divide the operators in Eq. (11) into simpler operators, as follows:

$$\begin{cases} e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}} &= e^{\frac{[x]_1 - L}{2^s}} \times e^{\frac{[x]_2 - L}{2^s}}, \\ e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}} &= e^{\frac{[x]_1 - L/2}{2^s}} \times e^{\frac{[x]_2 - L/2}{2^s}}, \\ e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2}{2^s}} &= e^{\frac{[x]_1}{2^s}} \times e^{\frac{[x]_2}{2^s}}. \end{cases}$$

For the participants P_1 and P_2 , since P_1 holds the secret share $[x]_1$, it can obtain $e^{\frac{[x]_1 - L}{2^s}}$, $e^{\frac{[x]_1 - L/2}{2^s}}$ and $e^{\frac{[x]_1}{2^s}}$ by local computation. Similarly, P_2 can obtain $e^{\frac{[x]_2 - L}{2^s}}$, $e^{\frac{[x]_2 - L/2}{2^s}}$ and $e^{\frac{[x]_2}{2^s}}$ through local computation by secret share $[x]_2$. Finally, the operator \cdot in Eq. (11) can be calculated by \mathcal{F}_{Mux} that allows the participants taking secret boolean shares and arithmetic shares as input to output a new pair of secret arithmetic shares. Eq. (12) is completely equivalent to Eq. (11), but it allows us to save one invocation of \mathcal{F}_{Mux} in the realization. Our implementation details of \mathcal{F}_{exp} are shown in Algorithm 1.

Security analysis. There are no interactions other than those generated by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$, \mathcal{F}_{msb} , $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOWrap}}$, \mathcal{F}_{AND} , \mathcal{F}_{Mux} , and \mathcal{F}_{TR} . The $[y]_i$ is randomly uniform and the security of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$, \mathcal{F}_{msb} , $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOWrap}}$, \mathcal{F}_{AND} , \mathcal{F}_{Mux} , \mathcal{F}_{TR} has been proved in previous work [10]. Therefore, the security of the proposed \mathcal{F}_{exp} follows in the $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{msb}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOWrap}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{AND}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{Mux}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{TR}})$ -hybrid.

TABLE III
THE ASSOCIATION FROM WRAP TO x'_f AND $e^{x'_f}$ WITH MSB ALWAYS TO BE 1.

wrap	msb	x'_f	$e^{x'_f}$
1	1	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}}$
0	1	$\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}$	$e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}}$

B. Exponential Function with Negative Input only

Motivation. Sigmoid and Tanh are two common activation functions in neural networks. Both the Sigmoid and Tanh functions invoke the exponential function for computation. It can be observed that these functions can be transformed to piecewise functions by appropriate math variations. With this, we can only deal with one piece of the functions in 2PC scenario and the other pieces can be efficiently solved by the symmetry of the function. Here, we design a secure 2PC protocol for exponential function with negative input only, denoted as $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$. With the limited input, we can design a protocol with better efficiency than \mathcal{F}_{exp} .

Design. Give a negative float number $x_f \in \mathbb{R}$, we transform it to be a fixed-point number $x \in \mathbb{Z}_L$ with $L = 2^l$ by Fix. Accordingly, x can be reversed to be a float number x'_f by rev as in III-A. To construct the secure 2PC protocol, the fixed-point number x is split into two additive secret shares $[x]_1$ and $[x]_2$ held by P_1 and P_2 , respectively. We have $\text{msb}(x)$ always to be 1 when x'_f is a negative number. For simplification, we write wrap and msb for $\text{wrap}(x)$ and $\text{msb}(x)$, respectively. Then, we list all possible cases of x'_f and $e^{x'_f}$ with $\text{msb} = 1$ in Table III, which is derived from Table II. According to Eq. (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x'_f &= \frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - \text{wrap} \cdot L - \text{msb} \cdot L}{2^s}, \\ &= \frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L - \text{wrap} \cdot L}{2^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with $\text{msb} = 1$. It can be further deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{x'_f} &= e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}} \cdot \text{wrap} \\ &\quad + e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}} \cdot (\text{wrap} \oplus 1), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which, similar to Eq. (12), can be optimized to be

$$\begin{aligned} e^{x'_f} &= \left(e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - 2L}{2^s}} - e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}} \right) \cdot \text{wrap} \\ &\quad + e^{\frac{[x]_1 + [x]_2 - L}{2^s}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Our realization details of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ is shown in Algorithm 2.

Security analysis. There are no interactions other than those generated by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOwrap}}$, \mathcal{F}_{mux} , and \mathcal{F}_{TR} . The $[y]_i$ is randomly uniform and the security of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOwrap}}$, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} , \mathcal{F}_{TR} has been proved in previous work, therefore, the security of the $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ follows in the ($\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOwrap}}$, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} , \mathcal{F}_{TR})-hybrid.

C. Sigmoid Function

Motivation. sigmoid is one of the most commonly used activation functions in neural networks, and is defined as

$$\text{sigmoid}(x_f) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x_f}}. \quad (16)$$

Algorithm 2 Secure 2PC protocol for exponential function with negative input $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$

Input: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i holds $[x]_i$.

Output: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i learns $[y]_i$.

1: P_i sets:

$$a_i = \text{Fix}\left(e^{\frac{[x]_i - L/2}{2^s}}, s'\right),$$

$b_i = \text{Fix}\left(e^{\frac{[x]_i - L}{2^s}}, s'\right)$, where $s' > s$ and will be discussed in Section VI-A.

2: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CrossTerm}}$ with inputs a_i, b_i to learn $[a']_i, [b']_i$, with $a' = a_1 \times a_2$ and $b' = b_1 \times b_2$.

3: P_1 sets $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_1 = 0$; P_2 sets: $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_2 = 1$.

4: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{msbTOwrap}}$ with inputs $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$ and $[x]_i$ to learn output $\langle \text{wrap} \rangle_i$.

5: P_i sets: $[tmp1]_i = [b']_i - [a']_i \bmod N$, where $N \geq L$ and will be discussed in Section V.

6: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Mux} with inputs $\langle \text{wrap} \rangle_i$ and $[tmp1]_i$ to learn $[tmp2]_i$.

7: P_i sets: $[rst]_i = [tmp2]_i + [a']_i \bmod N$.

8: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{TR} with inputs $[rst]_i$ and common parameter $2s' - s$ to learn final output $[y]_i$.

The computation of $\text{sigmoid}(x_f)$ can be naturally divided into the following three steps: first, calculate e^{-x_f} ; then, $1 + e^{-x_f}$; and finally, calculate the reciprocal of $1 + e^{-x_f}$ to obtain the final result. In secure 2PC scenario, e^{-x_f} can be computed by our proposed \mathcal{F}_{exp} protocol. The addition operation $1 + e^{-x_f}$ on secret shares can be done locally on two parties. Then, the calculation of reciprocal of $1 + e^{-x_f}$ is the major challenge for the secure sigmoid protocol.

The multiplication-based iterative algorithm is the usual method to compute reciprocal, which converges quadratically [24], [25]. However, the multiplication-based iterative algorithm requires an approximate estimate of result to initialize the iterative algorithm, so as to determine an α such that $2^\alpha \leq v < 2^{\alpha+1}$, where v is the number for which we need to calculate the reciprocal. It is a time-consuming operation.

Design. It can be found that we always have $2^0 \leq 1 + e^{-x_f} < 2^1$ with $x_f > 0$ and $2^0 \leq 1 + e^{x_f} < 2^1$ with $x_f < 0$. Accordingly, SIRNN [10] transforms the sigmoid function into the following piecewise functions,

$$\text{sigmoid}(x_f) = \begin{cases} 0.5, & \text{if } x_f = 0; \\ \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f > 0; \\ e^{x_f} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + e^{x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f < 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

It saves the cost incurred in computing α , which is considerable expensive. Different from the previous work, we observe that Eq. (17) can be further optimized as

$$\text{sigmoid}(x_f) = \begin{cases} 0.5, & \text{if } x_f = 0; \\ \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f > 0; \\ 1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f < 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

through the symmetry of the function. This optimization allows us to save one invocation to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Mult}}$ and \mathcal{F}_{TR} compared to [10] during the implementation of the sigmoid protocol.

At first glance, Eq. (18) can be further simplified to be

$$\text{sigmoid}(x_f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+e^{-x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f \leq 0; \\ 1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{x_f}}, & \text{if } x_f > 0, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

which can further save one invocation to \mathcal{F}_{msb} and \mathcal{F}_{B2A} . But please note that we have $1+e^{x_f} = 2$ when $x_f = 0$, which does not satisfy the requirement ($1+e^{x_f} < 2$) in multiplication-based iterative algorithm. Different from the previous work, we introduce a trivial error to solve this problem. In our protocol, a floating-point number x_f will be transformed to be its fixed-point representation x . Then, let $x \leftarrow x + 1$ when $\text{msb} = 0$, which means we add a tiny error $\varepsilon = 2^{-s}$ to all positive number x'_f which denotes the float number transformed back from the fixed-point number x . Then, the function Eq. (19) can be transformed into the following piecewise functions,

$$\text{sigmoid}(x'_f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+e^{-x'_f-\varepsilon}}, & \text{if } x'_f \geq 0 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{x'_f}}, & \text{if } x'_f < 0. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

which can further save one invocation to \mathcal{F}_{msb} and \mathcal{F}_{B2A} compared to [10] during the implementation of the sigmoid protocol. For ease of expression, we define negx as

$$\text{negx} = \begin{cases} -(x+1), & \text{if } \text{msb} = 0, \\ x, & \text{if } \text{msb} = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to deduce that

$$\text{rev}(\text{negx}) = \begin{cases} -x'_f - \varepsilon, & \text{if } \text{msb} = 0, \\ x'_f, & \text{if } \text{msb} = 1, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

and $\text{rev}(\text{negx})$ is always negative. According to Eq. (20) and Eq. (21), we have

$$\text{sigmoid}(x'_f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, & \text{if } \text{msb} = 0, \\ 1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, & \text{if } \text{msb} = 1. \end{cases}$$

Finally, our implementation details of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ is presented in Algorithm 3.

Security analysis. There are no interactions other than those generated by \mathcal{F}_{msb} , \mathcal{F}_{mux} , $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, and \mathcal{F}_{Rec} . The $[y]_i$ is randomly uniform and the security of \mathcal{F}_{msb} , \mathcal{F}_{mux} , \mathcal{F}_{Rec} has been proved in previous work. The security of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ has been proved in Section IV-B. Therefore, the security of the $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ follows in the $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{msb}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{mux}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{Rec}})$ -hybrid.

D. Tanh Function

Motivation. Tanh is another most commonly used activation functions in neural networks, and is defined as

$$\text{Tanh}(x_f) = \frac{1 - e^{-2x_f}}{1 + e^{-2x_f}}.$$

Algorithm 3 Secure 2PC sigmoid protocol $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$

Input: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i holds $[x]_i$.

Output: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i learns $[y]_i$.

- 1: P_1 sets: $[2x+1]_1 = 2 \cdot [x]_1 + 1$;
 P_2 sets: $[2x+1]_2 = 2 \cdot [x]_2$.
 - 2: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{msb} with input $[x]_i$ to learn output $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$.
 - 3: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Mux} with inputs $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$ and $[2x+1]_i$ to learn $[(2x+1) \cdot \text{msb}]_i$.
 - 4: P_1 sets: $[\text{negx}]_1 = [(2x+1) \cdot \text{msb}]_1 - [x]_1 - 1$.
 P_2 sets: $[\text{negx}]_2 = [(2x+1) \cdot \text{msb}]_2 - [x]_2$.
 - 5: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ with input $[\text{negx}]_i$ to learn $[\text{Fix}(e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_i$.
 - 6: P_1 sets: $[\text{Fix}(1 + e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_1$
 $= \text{Fix}(1, s) + [\text{Fix}(e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_1$;
 P_2 sets: $[\text{Fix}(1 + e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_2$
 $= [\text{Fix}(e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_2$.
 - 7: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Rec} with input $[\text{Fix}(1 + e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}, s)]_i$ to learn output $[\text{Fix}(\frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s)]_i$.
 - 8: P_1 sets: $[\text{Fix}((1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s))]_1$
 $= \text{Fix}(1, s) - 2 \cdot [\text{Fix}(\frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s)]_1$;
 P_2 sets: $[\text{Fix}((1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s))]_2$
 $= -2 \cdot [\text{Fix}(\frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s)]_2$.
 - 9: P_i invokes \mathcal{F}_{Mux} with inputs $[\text{Fix}(1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s)]_i$ and $\langle \text{msb} \rangle_i$ to learn $[\text{Fix}((1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s) \cdot \text{msb}, s)]_i$.
 - 10: P_i sets: $[y]_i = [\text{Fix}(\frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s)]_i$
 $+ [\text{Fix}((1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{\text{rev}(\text{negx})}}, s) \cdot \text{msb}, s)]_i$.
-

Algorithm 4 Secure 2PC Tanh protocol $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$

Input: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i holds $[x]_i$.

Output: For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, P_i learns $[y]_i$.

- 1: P_1 sets: $[2x]_1 = 2 \cdot [x]_1$;
 P_2 sets: $[2x]_2 = 2 \cdot [x]_2$.
 - 2: P_i invokes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ with input $[2x]_i$ to learn output $[\text{Fix}(\text{sigmoid}(\text{rev}(2x)), s)]_i$.
 - 3: P_1 sets: $[y]_1 = 2 \cdot [\text{Fix}(\text{sigmoid}(\text{rev}(2x)), s)]_1 - \text{Fix}(1, s)$;
 P_2 sets: $[y]_2 = 2 \cdot [\text{Fix}(\text{sigmoid}(\text{rev}(2x)), s)]_2$.
-

In secure 2PC scenario, the intention of P_i is to obtain the secret result of $\text{Fix}(\text{Tanh}(x'_f), s)$ without revealing any information about its $[x]_i$.

Design. The Tanh and sigmoid functions are closely related [26]: $\text{Tanh}(x_f) = 2 \cdot \text{sigmoid}(2x_f) - 1$. Thus, the implementation of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ can be realized by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$. The implementation details of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ is presented in Algorithm 4.

Security analysis. There are no interactions other than those generated by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and the $[y]_i$ is randomly uniform, so that the $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ is as safe as $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$. The security of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ has been proved in Section IV-C.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

Our implementation is written in C++ and uses the fundamental 2PC protocols from SIRNN [10], which are available in the EzPC library [33]. Similar to SIRNN, our proposed protocols also accept non-uniform bit-width inputs and outputs. We provide a complete implementation and test code

TABLE IV
THE MAX UPL ERRORS OF THE PROTOCOLS WITH VARIOUS s' .

Functions	Max ULP Errors on a variety of s'															
	$s + 0$	$s + 1$	$s + 2$	$s + 3$	$s + 4$	$s + 5$	$s + 6$	$s + 7$	$s + 8$	$s + 9$	$s + 10$	$s + 11$	$s + 12$	$s + 13$	$s + 14$	$s + 15$
\mathcal{F}_{exp}	2977	1484	745	372	186	93	46	24	12	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
$\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$	2935	1421	722	349	180	88	44	22	11	6	3	2	1	1	1	1
$\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$	749	369	185	93	46	23	12	6	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
$\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$	3048	1492	735	362	182	92	47	24	12	7	5	4	4	4	4	4

for the proposed 2PC protocol to confirm the correctness and feasibility of our approach, and the code will be open sourced on GitHub¹.

We set the same precision parameter s for both input and output in our implementation, but in some steps of Algorithm 1 and 2, we have to use a larger precision parameter $s' (> s)$ to increase the precision as the exponential function can magnify the error dramatically. Additionally, the N in Algorithm 1 and 2 defines the size of ring \mathbb{Z}_N , which can be set to 2^{64} as a maximum. And we require that the real floating-point result not exceed N after scaling $2^{2s'} \times$. Accordingly, the selection of s' is limited by both N and the range of the result. As a result, we can leave 4 bits to express the integer parts. Also, in the implementation of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ as in Algorithm 3 and 4, it is necessary to use SIRNN's $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ protocol for inputs with integer parts exceeding 4 bits.

For 2PC RNN inference, we followed SIRNN's construction by just replacing the protocols for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ with ours in EzPC library. In addition, we used SeeDot [34] to convert the floating-point code of the FastGRNN [35] network architecture into the EzPC code. The generated Ezpc code is then automatically compiled into a secure and efficient computation protocol for the same code by EzPC framework.

VI. EVALUATION

This section tests the accuracy and efficiency of the proposed protocols. And we have successfully implemented the state-of-the-art 2PC FastGRNN [35] inference on Google-30 dataset with the proposed protocols.

Experiment Setup. The experiments are conducted on a computer with an Intel i9-12900KF CPU and 128GB RAM. We created two docker containers with ubuntu 20.04 image, which represent the two participants P_1 and P_2 . To simulate LAN environment and WAN environment respectively, we use traffic control (TC) command to set port speed limit. The bandwidth between P_1 and P_2 is about 358 MBps for LAN and 45 MBps for WAN, respectively. The round-trip time is about 0.3 ms for LAN and 40 ms for WAN, respectively. Each experiment was repeated more than 5 times, and we calculated the average of the maximum and minimum latency as the latency result.

Benchmarks. We compared our scheme in terms of precision and efficiency with SIRNN [10], which is the most advanced 2PC system running in semi honest settings. For precision, we use the ULP errors as benchmarks; and for efficiency, the running time is the final index which is determined by the communication loads and number of communication

rounds. Generally, given a task one can reduce the running time by packing the communication loads together. With a large *batch size*, the communication time will be determined by communication load; while with a small *batch size*, the communication time will be consumed the number of communication rounds. Finally, we applied our sigmoid and Tanh protocols to an end-to-end secure RNN inference, and also compare the performance with SIRNN [10].

A. ULP Errors

In this section, we evaluate the precision of the proposed protocols with Max ULP errors, which is an established precision metric in many previous works. In our evaluations, we represent the input by a bit length of $s + 4$. Here s is the magnifying scale as in Eq. 1, which defines the precision of input reserved. Then, 4 bits is leaved to represent the integer part of input, which determines the range of input in $(-8, 8)$. We set the same s for output to get the same precision. For efficiency, we set the bit-width of output to the minimum length which is able to correctly represent the output. Specifically, the bit-width of output (bw_o) in \mathcal{F}_{exp} is set to $s + 13$ and the bit-width of output in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ are all set to $s + 2$.

As mentioned in Section V, in some steps of Algorithm 1 and 2, we have to use a larger precision parameter $s' (> s)$ to increase the precision as the exponential function can magnify the error dramatically. However, our implementation does not allow $bw_o - s + 2s'$ to exceed 64 where bw_o denotes the output length. Accordingly, the we can only set $s' = s + 9$ as a maximum for \mathcal{F}_{exp} and obtain the Max ULP Error of 6. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$, we can set $s' = s + 15$ and obtain the Max ULP Error of 1, 3, and 4, respectively.

To ensure the accuracy of the results, we set s' to $s + 9$, $s + 12$, $s + 9$, and $s + 11$ for \mathcal{F}_{exp} , $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$, respectively, in the following evaluation. With this setting, we compare the precision of our protocols with some previous ones. As shown in Table V, we achieve a state-of-the-art precision on \mathcal{F}_{exp} , $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$.

B. Number of Building Blocks

In this section, we compare the number of building blocks invoked in protocols as shown in Table VI. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, we take a distinct technical route, and therefore have significant differences on building blocks. SIRNN used $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DigDec}}$ to decompose an l -bit number into c sub-strings of length d , where the d is set as 8 by default. It can be realized as in [10] with $(l/d - 1)(\lambda(d + 2) + 15d + 20)$ bits of total communication. SIRNN designed \mathcal{F}_{LUT} to take a d -bits number x as input and

¹<https://github.com/Samsara430381/2PC.git>.

TABLE V
THE MAX UPL ERRORS OF THE PROTOCOLS COMPARED WITH PRIOR WORKS.

Technique	Max Errors (in ULP)			
	\mathcal{F}_{exp}	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$
SecureML [2]	-	-	1547	-
MiniONN [5] 12-piece	-	-	104	-
MiniONN [5] 48-piece	-	-	4	-
SIRNN [10]	-	3	3	4
MP-SPDZ [16]	10557	2	2	-
Ours	6	1	3	4

output a n -bits result y such that $y = T(x)$. It can be realized using a single call to $\binom{2^d}{1}$ -OT $_n$ with communication $2\lambda + 2^d n$ bits [27]. To sum up, our protocol needs fewer building blocks both in types and numbers, and achieves less communication traffic theoretically.

C. Communication Rounds

In this section, we test the required communication rounds with prior works with $s = 12$ and 16 , respectively. Theoretically, our protocols only need a constant rounds of communication which is fewer than that in SIRNN [10] as shown in Table VII. Compared with MP-SPDZ [16], we have fewer communication rounds in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ and similar communication rounds in \mathcal{F}_{exp} and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$.

D. Communication Traffic

This section tests and compares the communication traffic. In real application, we can reduce communication burden by packing the communication loads together. Here, we pack the communication of 16384 instances of protocol together. And the communication traffic is taken as the averaged of these instances.

As shown in Fig. 1, our $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ takes less communication traffic than that in SIRNN [10] with $s > 12$. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$, we reduce the communication traffic by using fewer building blocks and our $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ (when $s > 12$). Fig. 2 and 3 demonstrate the effectiveness of our strategy. Table VIII exhibits the communication traffic for one instance with $s = 16$. It is shown that our implementation has much less communication traffic than MP-SPDZ [16]. Compared to SIRNN [10], the communication traffic is reduced by more than 35% for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$, and reduced by more than 40% for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$.

E. Run-time

In this section, we test the run-time of the protocols. We pack the 16384 instances together with $s = 16$, and record the total running time in both LAN and WAN environments. The results are obtained by 4 threads in parallel as listed in Table IX and Table X. Compared with MP-SPDZ [16], our realization achieves two orders of magnitude faster. Compared with SIRNN [10], the proposed $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ runs about three times faster due to fewer communication rounds and less communication traffic. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$, our implementation also saves about 40% of the running time compared to SIRNN.




Fig. 1. The communication traffic of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{expn}}$ with different scale s .




Fig. 2. The communication traffic of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ with different scale s .

F. RNN Inference Case Study

In this section, we reproduce the inference experiments in [10], where FastGRNN [35] network is used to inference on Google-30 dataset. FastGRNN invokes 100 $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$ and 100 $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sigmoid}}$, the bitwidth for both input and output is 16, and the scale s for input and output are 8 and 14, respectively. For $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$, the bitwidth for both input and output is also 16, and the scale s for both input and output are 9. As shown in Table XI, our implementation saves about 20% of time at the sigmoid and Tanh parts in LAN environment, and the saving is more in the WAN.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we improved the secure implementations for four non-linear functions in SIRNN, including exponential function, exponential function with nonpositive inputs, sigmoid function, and tanh function. We take advantage of the intrinsic features of functions as well as tiny tricks. We tested the precision, number of building blocks, communication rounds, communication traffic, and run-time of the proposed




Fig. 3. The communication traffic of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Tanh}}$ with different scale s .

TABLE VI

THE REQUIRED BUILDING BLOCKS FOR THE PROTOCOLS. l DENOTES THE BIT LENGTH OF THE INPUT DIGIT AND d IS SET AS 8 BY DEFAULT.

Protocol	Technique	Building blocks
\mathcal{F}_{exp}	-	-
	Ours	$\mathcal{F}_{CrossTerm} \times 3, \mathcal{F}_{msb} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{msbTOwrap} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{AND} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{TR} \times 1$
\mathcal{F}_{expn}	SIRNN [10]	$\mathcal{F}_{DigDec} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{LUT} \times \lceil l/d \rceil, \mathcal{F}_{Mult} \times (\lceil l/d \rceil - 1), \mathcal{F}_{TR} \times (\lceil l/d \rceil - 1)$
	Ours	$\mathcal{F}_{CrossTerm} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{msbTOwrap} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{TR} \times 1$
$\mathcal{F}_{sigmoid}$	SIRNN [10]	$\mathcal{F}_{msb} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Rec} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{expn} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{B2A} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mult} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{TR} \times 1$
	Ours	$\mathcal{F}_{msb} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Rec} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{expn} \times 1$
\mathcal{F}_{Tanh}	SIRNN [10]	$\mathcal{F}_{msb} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Rec} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{expn} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{B2A} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mult} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{TR} \times 1$
	Ours	$\mathcal{F}_{msb} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{Mux} \times 2, \mathcal{F}_{Rec} \times 1, \mathcal{F}_{expn} \times 1$

TABLE VII

THE COMMUNICATION ROUNDS OF THE PROTOCOLS WITH $s = 12$ AND 16.

Technique	Scale	Rounds			
		\mathcal{F}_{exp}	\mathcal{F}_{expn}	$\mathcal{F}_{sigmoid}$	\mathcal{F}_{Tanh}
MP-SPDZ [16]	12	24	24	56	-
	16	34	34	62	-
SIRNN [10]	12	-	26	97	91
	16	-	46	117	109
Ours	12	23	12	61	61
	16				

TABLE VIII

THE COMMUNICATION TRAFFIC FOR ONE INSTANCE WITH $s = 16$.

Technique	Communication traffic (in KB)			
	\mathcal{F}_{exp}	\mathcal{F}_{expn}	$\mathcal{F}_{sigmoid}$	\mathcal{F}_{Tanh}
MP-SPDZ [16]	182.27	182.27	3030.36	-
SIRNN [10]	-	3.80	7.47	7.58
Ours	3.74	2.45	4.47	4.50

TABLE IX

RUN-TIME OF THE PROTOCOLS FOR 16384 INSTANCES IN LAN.

Technique	Run-time (in ms)			
	\mathcal{F}_{exp}	\mathcal{F}_{expn}	$\mathcal{F}_{sigmoid}$	\mathcal{F}_{Tanh}
MP-SPDZ [16]	419	419	103621	-
SIRNN [10]	-	172	314	327
Ours	143	95	186	189
	-	(55%)	(59%)	(58%)

TABLE X

RUN-TIME OF THE PROTOCOLS FOR 16384 INSTANCES IN WAN.

Technique	Run-time (in seconds)			
	\mathcal{F}_{exp}	\mathcal{F}_{expn}	$\mathcal{F}_{sigmoid}$	\mathcal{F}_{Tanh}
MP-SPDZ [16]	6.79	6.79	1884.15	-
SIRNN [10]	-	3.16	5.71	5.39
Ours	1.99	1.35	3.20	3.15
	-	(43%)	(56%)	(58%)

TABLE XI

INFERENCE EXPERIMENTS ON GOOGLE-30 DATASET WITH FASTGRNN NETWORK (ONLY SIGMOID AND TANH).

Technique	Communication traffic	LAN(in seconds)	WAN(in seconds)
SIRNN	98.93MB	10.17	442.96
Ours	78.16MB	8.27	340.06
	(79%)	(81%)	(77%)

protocols, and the experimental results demonstrate our design outperforms the state-of-the-arts. We also test the performance of our protocols in the typical FastGRNN networks on Google-30 dataset. The results prove the correctness and efficiency of our protocols. Our strategies and contributions are not

limited to the functionalities and applications presented in this paper. Our strategies have interesting effects on other symmetric functions as well, and our exponential protocol is not limited to RNN inference applications. It is also an indispensable building block for softmax activation functions commonly used in DNN training and Poisson regression.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Voigt and A. Von dem Bussche, "The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr)," *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing*, vol. 10, no. 3152676, pp. 10–5555, 2017.
- [2] P. Mohassel and Y. Zhang, "Secureml: A system for scalable privacy-preserving machine learning," in *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 19–38.
- [3] O. Goldreich, S. Micali, and A. Wigderson, "How to play any mental game, or a completeness theorem for protocols with honest majority," in *Providing Sound Foundations for Cryptography: On the Work of Shafi Goldwasser and Silvio Micali*, 2019, pp. 307–328.
- [4] A. C. Yao, "Protocols for secure computations," in *23rd annual symposium on foundations of computer science (sfcs 1982)*. IEEE, 1982, pp. 160–164.
- [5] J. Liu, M. Juuti, Y. Lu, and N. Asokan, "Oblivious neural network predictions via minionn transformations," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 2017, pp. 619–631.
- [6] Q. Feng, D. He, Z. Liu, H. Wang, and K.-K. R. Choo, "Securemlp: A system for multi-party privacy-preserving natural language processing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 3709–3721, 2020.
- [7] D. Rathee, M. Rathee, N. Kumar, N. Chandran, D. Gupta, A. Rastogi, and R. Sharma, "Cryptflow2: Practical 2-party secure inference," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2020, pp. 325–342.
- [8] P. Mishra, R. Lehmkühl, A. Srinivasan, W. Zheng, and R. A. Popa, "Delphi: a cryptographic inference service for neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*, 2020, pp. 2505–2522.
- [9] A. Patra, T. Schneider, A. Suresh, and H. Yalame, "Aby2. 0: Improved mixed-protocol secure two-party computation," in *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2021, pp. 2165–2182.
- [10] D. Rathee, M. Rathee, R. K. K. Goli, D. Gupta, R. Sharma, N. Chandran, and A. Rastogi, "Sirnn: A math library for secure rnn inference," in *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1003–1020.
- [11] Z. Huang, W.-j. Lu, C. Hong, and J. Ding, "Cheetah: Lean and fast secure {Two-Party} deep neural network inference," in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, 2022, pp. 809–826.
- [12] K. Gupta, D. Kumaraswamy, N. Chandran, and D. Gupta, "Llama: A low latency math library for secure inference," *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 4, pp. 274–294, 2022.
- [13] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [14] G. Huang, Z. Liu, L. Van Der Maaten, and K. Q. Weinberger, "Densely connected convolutional networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 4700–4708.

- [15] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, "Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 4510–4520.
- [16] M. Keller, "Mp-spdz: A versatile framework for multi-party computation," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 2020, pp. 1575–1590.
- [17] S. Micali, O. Goldreich, and A. Wigderson, "How to play any mental game," in *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing, STOC*. ACM New York, NY, USA, 1987, pp. 218–229.
- [18] B. D. Rouhani, M. S. Riazi, and F. Koushanfar, "Deepsecure: Scalable provably-secure deep learning," in *Proceedings of the 55th annual design automation conference*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [19] X. Fan, K. Chen, G. Wang, M. Zhuang, Y. Li, and W. Xu, "Nfgen: Automatic non-linear function evaluation code generator for general-purpose mpc platforms," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 995–1008.
- [20] D. Demmler, T. Schneider, and M. Zohner, "Aby-a framework for efficient mixed-protocol secure two-party computation," in *NDSS*, 2015.
- [21] A. C.-C. Yao, "How to generate and exchange secrets," in *27th annual symposium on foundations of computer science (Sfcs 1986)*. IEEE, 1986, pp. 162–167.
- [22] S. Wagh, S. Tople, F. Benhamouda, E. Kushilevitz, P. Mittal, and T. Rabin, "F: Honest-majority maliciously secure framework for private deep learning," *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2021, no. 1, pp. 188–208, 2021.
- [23] Z. Ge, Z. Zhou, D. Guo, and Q. Li, "Practical two-party privacy-preserving neural network based on secret sharing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.04709*, 2021.
- [24] R. E. Goldschmidt, "Applications of division by convergence," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1964.
- [25] M. Ito, N. Takagi, and S. Yajima, "Efficient initial approximation for multiplicative division and square root by a multiplication with operand modification," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 495–498, 1997.
- [26] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- [27] G. Dessouky, F. Koushanfar, A.-R. Sadeghi, T. Schneider, S. Zeitouni, and M. Zohner, "Pushing the communication barrier in secure computation using lookup tables," 2017.
- [28] E. Wang, Q. Zhang, B. Shen, G. Zhang, X. Lu, Q. Wu, Y. Wang, E. Wang, Q. Zhang, B. Shen *et al.*, "Intel math kernel library," *High-Performance Computing on the Intel® Xeon Phi™: How to Fully Exploit MIC Architectures*, pp. 167–188, 2014.
- [29] R. Canetti, "Security and composition of multiparty cryptographic protocols," *Journal of CRYPTOLOGY*, vol. 13, pp. 143–202, 2000.
- [30] Y. Lindell, "How to simulate it—a tutorial on the simulation proof technique," *Tutorials on the Foundations of Cryptography: Dedicated to Oded Goldreich*, pp. 277–346, 2017.
- [31] D. Beaver, "Efficient multiparty protocols using circuit randomization," in *Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO'91: Proceedings 11*. Springer, 1992, pp. 420–432.
- [32] Z. Xia, Q. Gu, W. Zhou, L. Xiong, J. Weng, and N. Xiong, "Str: Secure computation on additive shares using the share-transform-reveal strategy," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 2021.
- [33] "Secure and correct inference (sci) library," June 2021, <https://github.com/mpc-msri/EzPC/tree/master/SCI>.
- [34] S. Gopinath, N. Ghanathe, V. Seshadri, and R. Sharma, "Compiling kb-sized machine learning models to tiny iot devices," in *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, 2019, pp. 79–95.
- [35] A. Kusupati, M. Singh, K. Bhatia, A. Kumar, P. Jain, and M. Varma, "Fastgrnn: A fast, accurate, stable and tiny kilobyte sized gated recurrent neural network," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.



Qian Feng received the B.S degree in Hunan University of Technology, Zhuzhou, China, in June 2021. He is currently pursuing the master's degree with the College of Cyberspace Security, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China. His research interests include Secure Multi-Party Computation and Privacy-preserving Machine Learning.




Zhihua Xia (Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in computer science and technology from Hunan University, China, in 2011. He was a Visiting Scholar with the New Jersey Institute of Technology, USA, in 2015. He was a Visiting Professor with Sungkyunkwan University, South Korea, in 2016. He is currently a Professor with the College of Cyberspace Security, Jinan University, China. His research interests include AI security, cloud computing security, and digital forensics. He is also the Managing Editor for IJAACS.



Zhifeng Xu received the B.S degree in Dongguan University of Technology, Dongguan, China, in June 2021. He is currently pursuing the master's degree with the College of Cyberspace Security, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China. His research interests include Distributed Computing and Secure Multi-Party Computation.



Jiashi Weng obtained her doctoral degree from Jinan University in China and served as a postdoctoral researcher at City University of Hong Kong. She is currently an associate professor at Jinan University. In the past five years, she has published more than 10 high-level papers in internationally renowned and top-tier journals and conferences such as IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security, IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing, and IEEE INFOCOM.



Jian Weng (Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in computer science and engineering from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China, in 2008. He is currently a Professor and the Dean with the College of Information Science and Technology, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China. His research interests include public key cryptography, cloud security, and block-chain. He was the PC Co-Chairs or PC Member for more than 30 international conferences. He also serves as an Associate Editor for the IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology.