

# Capacity of Hierarchical Secure Coded Gradient Aggregation with Straggling Communication Links

Qinyi Lu, Jiale Cheng, Wei Kang and Nan Liu

**Abstract**—The growing privacy concerns in distributed learning have led to the widespread adoption of secure aggregation techniques in distributed machine learning systems, such as federated learning. Motivated by a coded gradient aggregation problem in a user-helper-master hierarchical network setting with straggling communication links, we formulate a new secure hierarchical coded gradient aggregation problem. In our setting,  $K$  users communicate with the master through an intermediate layer of  $N$  helpers, who can communicate with each other. With a resiliency threshold of  $N_r$  for straggling communication links, and at most  $T$  colluding helpers and any number of colluding users, the master aims to recover the sum of all users' gradients while remaining unaware of any individual gradient that exceeds the expected sum. In addition, helpers cannot infer more about users' gradients than what is already known by the colluding users. We propose an achievable scheme where users' upload messages are based on a globally known Vandermonde matrix, and helper communication is facilitated using an extended Vandermonde matrix with special structural properties. A matching converse bound is also derived, establishing the optimal result for this hierarchical coded gradient aggregation problem.

**Index Terms**—Secure aggregation, straggling, hierarchical network, distributed learning, gradient coding.

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the widespread use of mobile devices and the continuous growth of data, distributed learning, particularly federated learning [1], [2], has emerged as a promising approach. In distributed learning systems, a large number of mobile users collaboratively train a global model using locally collected datasets, with the local updates being aggregated by a central server.

As revealed in [3], the uploading of users' local updates can expose sensitive information. Aiming to enhance security and enable collaborative model training, Bonawitz *et al.* introduced a practical secure aggregation protocol, referred to as *SecAgg*, in [4]. In the *SecAgg* protocol, pairwise random masks between users ensure the security of individual users and enable the central server to obtain the desired aggregation, with the pairwise random masks from different users canceling each other out. A series of subsequent studies have focused on developing improved secure aggregation protocols, aiming to achieve higher communication efficiency, accommodate diverse security constraints, enhance robustness against user straggling, and address other related challenges [5]–[20]. More

specifically, So, *et al.* focused on robustness against user straggling by employing efficient methods, such as random mask reconstruction for dropped users or turbo aggregation, thereby reducing the communication overhead introduced by the masks [5], [6]. Under the information-theoretic system model framework, the secure aggregation problem with straggling and colluding users [7]–[9], as well as groupwise keys [10]–[12], has been studied. When the focus is not only on a single round of training in distributed learning, problems including multi-round privacy leakage [13] and buffered asynchronous aggregation [14], [15] have been extensively studied.

The secure aggregation problems mentioned above are primarily based on a simple user-server network architecture. However, in practical applications, mobile users may be located at a considerable distance from the central server, resulting in high latency and low bandwidth. As a result, hierarchical distributed learning systems have garnered widespread research attention [21]–[29]. More specifically, Prakash *et al.* investigate the coded gradient aggregation problem in a hierarchical setup, where multiple users collaborate with reliable helper nodes to assist in gradient aggregation at the master node, as described in [26]. This study, along with subsequent works [27]–[29], focuses on the robustness of the straggling user-to-helper links and explores methods to minimize the communication load between users and helpers, as well as between helpers and the master node.

In this paper, we investigate a hierarchical coded gradient aggregation (HCGA) problem similar to those in [26], [28], [29], while also incorporating additional security constraints to protect user data privacy. Secure aggregation in hierarchical distributed learning systems has been explored in [30]–[33]. Unlike the existing works on hierarchical secure aggregation mentioned above, we consider a different hierarchical network model, where each user is connected to multiple helpers and focus on the robustness of the straggling user-to-helper links and helper-to-master links. Such different assumptions can be found in practical applications in [26]–[29].

The new proposed hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation problem contains  $K$  users,  $N$  helpers and one master. Each user holds a private gradient  $W_k$  and is connected to every helper, with the helpers being interconnected and all linked to the master. The links between users and helpers, as well as those between helpers and the master, may experience straggling. The master wishes to recover the aggregation, i.e.,  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$ , under the condition that at least  $N_r$  out of  $N$  helpers from each user are non-straggling, and at least  $N_r$  helpers are non-straggling in the transmission to the master. When considering the security of a user's gradient, we account

Q. Lu and W. Kang are with the School of Information Science and Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, China. (e-mail: {qylu, wkang}@seu.edu.cn). J. Cheng is with EECS Department of the University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA. (e-mail: jlcheng@umich.edu). N. Liu is with the National Mobile Communications Research Laboratory, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, China. (e-mail: nanliu@seu.edu.cn).

for two types of collusion: at most  $T$  helpers may collude with each other or with the master, and each user may collude with either the helpers or the master. The security constraints require that, under the two types of collusion mentioned above: (1) any set of at most  $T$  colluding helpers cannot infer any additional information about users' gradients beyond what is already known by the colluding users, and (2) the master cannot infer any additional information about users' gradients beyond what is contained in  $W$  and what is already known by the colluding users.

Given the parameters  $(K, N, N_r, T)$ , the objective of this work is to design a hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation scheme that minimizes the communication rate. We propose an achievable scheme consisting of three phases, users uploading, sharing and computation, and reconstruction. The design of the users' upload messages is based on a globally known Vandermonde matrix, while the sharing messages between helpers are constructed using an extended Vandermonde matrix with special structural properties. In addition, we derive a matching converse bound, showing that when  $N_r \leq T$ , secure aggregation is not feasible, whereas when  $N_r > T$ , both the user-to-helper and helper-to-master optimal communication rates are  $\frac{1}{N_r - T}$ .

### A. Paper Organization

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section II presents the model of hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation with straggling communication links, while Section III states the main results. Section IV presents a toy example and describes the proposed general hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation scheme, while Section V provides the matching converse bounds. Section VI provides the conclusion of the paper.

### B. Notations

We use  $[a : b]$  to denote the set  $\{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$ , and  $[a] = [1 : a]$  to denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$ . For  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|\mathcal{I}|} \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $X_{\mathcal{I}} = (X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} = (X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_{|\mathcal{I}|}})$  denotes a vector composed of  $X_i$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , arranged in lexicographical order;  $(X_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} = (X_{\mathcal{I},j})_{j \in \mathcal{J}} = ((X_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}})_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ ;  $X_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}} = (X_{i,j})_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}}$ ;  $\mathbb{F}_q$  denotes finite field with size  $q$ ;  $\mathbf{0}_{m \times n}$  denotes the zero matrix with dimension  $m \times n$ ;  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{M})$  denotes the rank of matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ ;  $\mathbf{e}_i^a \in \mathbb{F}_q^{a \times 1}$  denotes the unit vector where the  $i$ -th element is 1 and the other elements are 0;  $\perp$  denotes the absence of a message being sent.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider a hierarchical distributed learning system consisting of  $K$  users,  $N$  helper nodes, and one master, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Each user is connected to every helper. The helpers are interconnected, and all of them are linked to the master. All communication links are secure and orthogonal. Partial links between users and helpers, as well as those between helpers and the master, may be straggling, while the remaining links are error-free. We consider the secure coded gradient aggregation problem in the network described above.




Fig. 1. Hierarchical distributed learning system with straggling communication links.

For  $k \in [K]$ , let the vector  $W_k$  denote the local gradient associated with user  $k$ 's local data and model. Each user  $k$  holds the input vector  $W_k$  and a self-generated random variable  $F_k$ . Suppose the user-side message vectors  $W_{[K]}$  and the user-side randomness vectors  $F_{[K]}$  are mutually independent, and each  $W_k$  is an  $L \times 1$  column vector, where the  $L$  elements are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) uniform symbols<sup>1</sup> from a sufficiently large finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , i.e.,

$$H(W_{[K]}, F_{[K]}) = \sum_{k=1}^K H(W_k) + \sum_{k=1}^K H(F_k), \quad (1)$$

$$H(W_k) = L(\text{in } q\text{-ary units}), \quad \forall k \in [K]. \quad (2)$$

The master needs to aggregate the sum of the local gradients, denoted by  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$ , with no error. To achieve this objective, a three-phase communication protocol is employed, consisting of the user uploading phase, the sharing and computation phase, and the reconstruction phase.

1) *Users Uploading Phase*: For  $k \in [K]$  and  $n \in [N]$ , user  $k$  transmits a message  $X_{k,n}$  to helper  $n$ , which is a function of  $W_k, F_k$ , and consists of  $L_X$  symbols<sup>2</sup> from  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Hence, we have

$$H(X_{k,n} | W_k, F_k) = 0, \quad \forall n \in [N], k \in [K]. \quad (3)$$

Due to the unreliability of communication links and helper straggling, some helpers may fail to receive the message from user  $k$ . The transmission described above, referred to as *user-to-helper* transmission, can be characterized by the following vector representing its pattern

$$\nu = (\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_K), \quad (4)$$

<sup>1</sup>The assumption of uniformity and independence for  $W_{[K]}$  is not necessary for the proposed achievable scheme. This property is used in the converse proof.

<sup>2</sup>Similar to [7],  $L_X$  and  $L_Y$  are set as constants, where we consider the worst case, i.e., the maximum length of  $X_{k,n}$  and  $Y_n^\nu$  over all possible cases.

where  $\mathcal{N}_k$ ,  $k \in [K]$ , denotes the set of helpers that successfully received messages from user  $k$ , and contains at least  $N_r$  helpers<sup>3</sup>, and  $1 \leq N_r \leq N - 1$ .

$$\mathcal{N}(N_r) = \{\nu | \mathcal{N}_k \subseteq [N], |\mathcal{N}_k| \geq N_r, k \in [K]\}. \quad (5)$$

The helpers that do not receive any users' messages are considered to be straggling and will not participate in subsequent transmissions and computations. The set of helpers surviving the user-to-edge transmission is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \triangleq \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \mathcal{N}_k. \quad (6)$$

We abuse the notation  $\mathcal{K}_n$  to denote the set of users from which helper  $n$  successfully receives messages, i.e.,  $\mathcal{K}_n = \{k | n \in \mathcal{N}_k\}$ . Hence, the message received by helper  $n$  from all  $K$  users can be denoted by  $X_{\mathcal{K}_n, n}$ .

2) *Sharing and Computation Phase*: These surviving helpers, i.e.,  $n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}$ , may share some messages based on the reception of user data by all helpers. Each helper stores a random variable, denoted by  $Z_n$ , which is generated and distributed by a trusted third-party entity. Let  $M_{n \rightarrow n'}^\nu$  denote the message transmitted from helper  $n$  to helper  $n'$ , where  $M_{n \rightarrow n'}^\nu$  is a function of  $X_{\mathcal{K}_n, n}$  and  $Z_n$ . Hence, we have

$$H(M_{n \rightarrow n'}^\nu | X_{\mathcal{K}_n, n}, Z_n) = 0, \quad \forall n, n' \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}, n \neq n', \forall \nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r). \quad (7)$$

After sharing between helpers, each helper  $n$  computes a response  $Y_n^\nu$  and transmits it to the master.  $Y_n^\nu$  is a function of all the messages held by helper  $n$  and consists  $L_Y$  symbols<sup>2</sup>. Hence, we have

$$H(Y_n^\nu | X_{\mathcal{K}_n, n}, Z_n, \mathcal{M}_n^\nu) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r), \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_n^\nu \triangleq (M_{i \rightarrow n}^\nu)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \setminus \{n\}}$  denotes the messages that helper  $n$  receives from other helpers.

3) *Reconstruction Phase*: Some helpers may straggle in the computation of  $Y_n^\nu$  or in the edge-to-cloud transmission. Let  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}$  denote the set of helpers from which the master successfully receives messages, and  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \subseteq [N]$  can be any set of at least  $N_r$  helpers, where  $1 \leq N_r \leq N - 1$ . The master then reconstructs the sum of the local gradients, i.e.,  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$ , from the received messages, i.e.,  $Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^\nu$ .

A scheme is considered achievable if it satisfies the following correctness constraint, along with two security constraints.

*Correctness*: The master must be able to decode the desired sum  $W$  from the messages received from helpers with no error, i.e.,

$$H(W | Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^\nu) = 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \mathcal{N}_k, |\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}| \geq N_r, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r). \quad (9)$$

There exist two types of collusion that could lead to the leakage of users' private gradient: (1) No more than  $T$  helpers

<sup>3</sup>For users that fail to transmit their messages to at least  $N_r$  helpers, we consider them to be straggling in this round of training, and their messages will not participate in the subsequent transmissions and computations.

may collude with each other or with the master, where  $0 \leq T \leq N$ ; (2) Each user may collude with either helpers or the master. We further impose that the security constraints must be upheld, even if straggled messages are received. More specifically, the two security constraints are described as follows.

*Security Against Helpers*: Any set of at most  $T$  colluding helpers and at most  $K$  colluding users cannot infer any additional information about  $W_{[K]}$  beyond what is already known by the colluding users, i.e.,

$$I(W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{U} \subseteq [K], \forall \mathcal{T} \subseteq [N], |\mathcal{T}| \leq T, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r) \quad (10)$$

*Security Against Master*: The master cannot infer any additional information about  $W_{[K]}$  beyond that contained in  $W$  and what is already known by the colluding users, even if at most  $T$  helpers and at most  $K$  users collude with the master, i.e.,

$$I(W_{[K]}; Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}}^\nu, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu | W, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{U} \subseteq [K], \forall \mathcal{T} \subseteq [N], |\mathcal{T}| \leq T, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r). \quad (11)$$

We define the communication rate as the ratio that characterizes the number of symbols contained in each message relative to the number of user-side message symbols, as follows

$$R_X \triangleq \frac{L_X}{L}, \quad R_Y \triangleq \frac{L_Y}{L}. \quad (12)$$

where  $R_X$ ,  $R_Y$  denote the rates of the user-to-helper and helper-to-master transmissions, respectively. A rate tuple  $(R_X, R_Y)$  is considered achievable if there exists a scheme in which the correctness and security constraints (9), (10), and (11) are satisfied, and the rates for the user-to-helper and helper-to-master transmissions do not exceed  $R_X$  and  $R_Y$ , respectively. The optimal rate region, denoted as  $\mathcal{R}^*$ , is defined as the closure of the set of all rate tuples that are achievable.

### III. MAIN RESULT

The following is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 1** *For the hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation problem with  $K$  users,  $N \geq 2$  helpers, a resiliency threshold of  $N_r$ , at most  $T$  colluding helpers, and any number of colluding users, the optimal rate region is given by*

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{when } N_r \leq T, \\ \left\{ (R_X, R_Y) : R_X \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}, R_Y \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T} \right\}, & \text{when } N_r > T, \end{cases}$$

*Proof*: We propose an achievable scheme for the case of  $N_r > T$  in Section IV, with the matching converse bounds provided in Subsections V-B and V-C, respectively. In addition, for the case of  $N_r \leq T$ , we show that the security constraints and the correctness constraint are contradictory, i.e.,  $\mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset$ , in Subsection V-A. ■

#### IV. ACHIEVABILITY

In this section, we provide the achievability proof of Theorem 1. We begin by using a simple example to illustrate the idea of the new proposed scheme.

*A. Motivating Example:*  $K = 2, N = 4, N_r = 3, T = 1$

Consider  $K = 2$  users and  $N = 4$  helpers, where at least  $N_r = 3$  helpers successfully receive the message from user  $k$ . Suppose the message length is  $L = N_r - T = 2$ , and the parameter of the large enough finite field is  $q = 7$ , i.e.,  $W_k = [W_{k,1}, W_{k,2}]^T \in \mathbb{F}_7^{2 \times 1}$ . We describe the achievable scheme under the transmission pattern  $\nu = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2\} = (\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\})$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} = \{2, 3, 4\}$ .

In the *users uploading phase*, each user uses a globally known Vandermonde matrix, to mix their local gradient with a privately chosen randomness, and then transmits the encoded messages to different helpers. More specifically, the message that user  $k$  uploads to helper node  $n$ , i.e.,  $X_{k,n}$ , is set as

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{k,1} \\ X_{k,2} \\ X_{k,3} \\ X_{k,4} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} W_{k,1} \\ W_{k,2} \\ F_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1^2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2^2 \\ 1 & 3 & 3^2 \\ 1 & 4 & 4^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W_{k,1} \\ W_{k,2} \\ F_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad k = 1, 2, \quad (13)$$

where  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are 2 i.i.d. uniform symbols over  $\mathbb{F}_7$ , and  $\mathbf{V}$  is a globally known Vandermonde matrix.

Each helper stores a decoding matrix for computation, denoted by  $\mathbf{S}_n$ , and a helper-side randomness, denoted by  $Z_n$ , generated and distributed by a trusted third-party entity. For any  $n \in [4]$ , the decoding matrix  $\mathbf{S}_n$  is set as

$$\mathbf{S}_n = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_n^{-1}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{G}_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & n & n^2 \\ 1 & 5 & 5^2 \\ 1 & 6 & 6^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Take  $n = 3, 4$  as examples, we have

$$\mathbf{S}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 5 \\ 2 & 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \mathbf{S}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 6 & 6 \\ 6 & 6 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider 16 i.i.d. uniform symbols over  $\mathbb{F}_7$ , denoted as  $Q_{n,j}^{(k)}, n \in [4], j \in [2], k \in [2]$ . Then, for any  $i \in [4]$ , the helper-side randomness  $Z_i$  is set as

$$Z_i = \left( Z_{i,n}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in [4] \setminus \{i\}, k \in [2]}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} Z_{1,n}^{(k)} \\ Z_{2,n}^{(k)} \\ Z_{3,n}^{(k)} \\ Z_{4,n}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{S}_n \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 5 \\ 1 & 6 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{n,1}^{(k)} \\ Q_{n,2}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Take  $n = 3, 4$  as examples, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} Z_{1,3}^{(k)} \\ Z_{2,3}^{(k)} \\ Z_{3,3}^{(k)} \\ Z_{4,3}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 5 \\ 6 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{3,1}^{(k)} \\ Q_{3,2}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} Z_{1,4}^{(k)} \\ Z_{2,4}^{(k)} \\ Z_{3,4}^{(k)} \\ Z_{4,4}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 3 \\ 2 & 6 \\ 5 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{4,1}^{(k)} \\ Q_{4,2}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

In the *sharing and computation phase*, based on the pattern of user-to-helper transmission, the messages between helpers are set as follows

$$M_{i \rightarrow j}^\nu = \begin{cases} X_{2,i} + Z_{i,3}^{(2)}, & i \in \mathcal{N}_2, j = 3, \\ X_{1,i} + Z_{i,4}^{(1)}, & i \in \mathcal{N}_1, j = 4, \\ \perp, & i \in [4] \setminus \{j\}, j = 1, 2, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Thus, we have  $\mathcal{M}_3^\nu = (M_{1 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{4 \rightarrow 3}^\nu)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_4^\nu = (M_{1 \rightarrow 4}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 4}^\nu, M_{3 \rightarrow 4}^\nu)$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_1^\nu = \mathcal{M}_2^\nu = \perp$ .

Then, helper 3 recovers the messages it failed to receive from  $\mathcal{M}_3^\nu$  by using the inverse matrix of the submatrix of  $\mathbf{S}_3$  as the decoding matrix, i.e.,

$$\hat{X}_{2,3} = [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \left( [(\mathbf{e}_i^4)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_2}]^\top \mathbf{S}_3 \right)^{-1} [M_{1 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{4 \rightarrow 3}^\nu]^\top.$$

Similarly, helper 4 recovers  $X_{1,4}$  by following

$$\hat{X}_{1,4} = [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \left( [(\mathbf{e}_i^4)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1}]^\top \mathbf{S}_4 \right)^{-1} [M_{1 \rightarrow 4}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 4}^\nu, M_{3 \rightarrow 4}^\nu]^\top.$$

The message that helper  $n$  transmits to the master, i.e.,  $Y_n^\nu$ , is set as

$$Y_n^\nu = \begin{cases} X_{1,n} + X_{2,n}, & n = 1, 2, \\ X_{1,3} + \hat{X}_{2,3}, & n = 3, \\ \hat{X}_{1,4} + X_{2,4}, & n = 4, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

*Proof of Correctness:* We show the correctness of the above scheme as follows. From the definition of  $\hat{X}_{2,3}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_{2,3} &= [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \left( [(\mathbf{e}_i^4)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_2}]^\top \mathbf{S}_3 \right)^{-1} [M_{1 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{4 \rightarrow 3}^\nu]^\top \\ &= [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 5 \\ 2 & 5 & 1 \\ 5 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} X_{2,1} + Z_{1,3}^{(2)} \\ X_{2,2} + Z_{2,3}^{(2)} \\ X_{2,4} + Z_{4,3}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (17a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 5 \\ 1 & 5 & 2 \\ 5 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 2^2 & 6 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 & 4^2 & 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W_{2,1} \\ W_{2,2} \\ F_2 \\ Q_{3,1}^{(2)} \\ Q_{3,2}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (17b)$$

$$= W_{2,1} + 3W_{2,2} + 2F_2 = X_{2,3}, \quad (17c)$$

where (17a) follows from the design of  $M_{i \rightarrow j}^\nu$ , i.e., (15), (17b) follows from (13) and (14), and (17c) follows from the design of  $X_{2,3}$  in (13).

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_{1,4} &= [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 6 & 6 \\ 6 & 6 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} X_{1,1} + Z_{1,4}^{(1)} \\ X_{1,2} + Z_{2,4}^{(1)} \\ X_{1,3} + Z_{4,4}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= [\mathbf{e}_1^3]^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 6 & 6 \\ 6 & 6 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 2^2 & 2 & 6 \\ 1 & 3 & 3^2 & 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W_{1,1} \\ W_{1,2} \\ F_1 \\ Q_{4,1}^{(1)} \\ Q_{4,2}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= W_{1,1} + 4W_{1,2} + 2F_1 = X_{1,4}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Substituting the result of (17c) and (18) into (16), we have  $Y_n = X_{1,n} + X_{2,n}, \forall n \in [4]$ . As any square submatrix of the

Vandermonde matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  has full rank, we can recover  $W_{1,1} + W_{2,1}$ ,  $W_{1,2} + W_{2,2}$ , and  $F_1 + F_2$  from the messages  $(X_{1,n} + X_{2,n})_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} = \{2,3,4\}}$ . Then, we can obtain  $W = W_1 + W_2 = (W_{1,1} + W_{2,1}, W_{1,2} + W_{2,2})$ .

When considering security against helpers or the master, we provide a security proof using  $\mathcal{T} = \{3\}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$  as an example to demonstrate how the scheme ensures security. The security proofs in other cases follows similar steps and can be found in the general proof in Subsection IV-B.

*Security Against Helpers:* Suppose  $\mathcal{T} = \{3\}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ . Then, following the message design shown above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(W_1, W_2; X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}, \mathcal{M}_3^\nu, Z_3) \\ &= I(W_1, W_2; X_{1,3}, X_{2,1} + 5Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, \\ & \quad X_{2,2} + 6Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, X_{2,4} + 3Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}) \quad (19a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= H(X_{1,3}, X_{2,1} + 5Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, X_{2,2} + 6Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, \\ & \quad X_{2,4} + 3Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}) - H(F_1, F_2 + 5Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, \\ & \quad 4F_2 + 6Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, 2F_2 + 3Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)} | W_1, W_2) \quad (19b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 4 - H(F_1, F_2, Q_{3,1}^{(2)}, Q_{3,2}^{(2)} | W_1, W_2) \quad (19c)$$

$$= 4 - 4 = 0, \quad (19d)$$

where (19a) follows from the fact that  $X_{2,3}$  can be decoded from  $\mathcal{M}_3^\nu$  (see (17c)), and from the fact that  $Z_3$  is a function of  $(Q_{i,j}^{(k)})_{i \in \{1,2,4\}, j \in \{1,2\}, k \in \{1,2\}}$ , which is independent of  $(W_1, W_2, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}, \mathcal{M}_3^\nu)$ , (19b) follows from (13), the first term of (19c) follows from the fact that  $X_{1,3}, M_{1 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{2 \rightarrow 3}^\nu, M_{4 \rightarrow 3}^\nu$  each contain 1 symbol, the second term of (19c) follows from the fact that  $F_2 + 5Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, 4F_2 + 6Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}, 2F_2 + 3Q_{3,1}^{(2)} + 3Q_{3,2}^{(2)}$  are 3 linearly independent linear combinations of  $F_2, Q_{3,1}^{(2)}, Q_{3,2}^{(2)}$ , and (19d) follows from the fact that  $F_1, F_2, Q_{3,1}^{(2)}, Q_{3,2}^{(2)}$  are 4 i.i.d. uniform random variables, and are independent of  $W_1, W_2$ .

*Security Against the Master:* First, we note that the message received by the master can be determined by  $W_1 + W_2, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & H(Y_{[4]}^\nu | W_1 + W_2, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}) \\ &= H((X_{1,n} + X_{2,n})_{n \in [4]} | W_1 + W_2, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}) \quad (20a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= H(W_{1,1} + W_{2,1}, W_{1,2} + W_{2,2}, F_1 + F_2 | W_1 + W_2, \\ & \quad W_{1,1} + 3W_{1,2} + 2F_1, W_{2,1} + 3W_{2,2} + 2F_2) \quad (20b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq H(F_1 + F_2 | W_1 + W_2, F_1 + F_2) = 0, \quad (20c)$$

where (20a) follows from the proof of correctness, and (20b) follows from (13).

Thus, suppose  $\mathcal{T} = \{3\}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(W_1, W_2; Y_{[4]}^\nu, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}, \mathcal{M}_3^\nu, Z_3 | W_1 + W_2) \\ & \leq I(W_1, W_2; X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}, \mathcal{M}_3^\nu, Z_3 | W_1 + W_2) \quad (21a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq I(W_1, W_2; X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}, \mathcal{M}_3^\nu, Z_3) \quad (21b)$$

$$\leq 0, \quad (21c)$$

where (21a) follows from (20c), (21b) follows from the fact that  $W_1 + W_2$  is a function of  $W_1, W_2$ , and (21c) follows from the result of (19d).

*Rate:* As  $L_X = L_Y = 1$ , we have  $R_X = R_Y = \frac{1}{L} = \frac{1}{2}$ .

## B. General Proof for Arbitrary $K, N, N_r, T$

We now generalize the above example to arbitrary values of  $K, N, N_r$  and  $T$  in order to present the achievability proof for Theorem 1. Since  $\mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset$  when  $N_r \leq T$ , it suffices to consider scenarios where  $N_r > T$ . We assume that the size of the finite field,  $q$ , is sufficiently large, i.e.,  $q \geq N + N_r$ . For cases where the finite field size is insufficient, a method similar to that discussed in [7] can be applied to obtain an extended field size. We omit this discussion here.

*Users Uploading Phase.* Each user  $k$ ,  $k \in [K]$ , independently generates a uniform  $\frac{LT}{N_r - T} \times 1$  column vector over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and assigns this vector to  $F_k$ . Then, user  $k$  divides each message  $W_k$  into  $N_r - T$  parts and each user-side randomness  $F_k$  into  $T$  parts, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} W_k &= [W_{k,1}^\top, W_{k,2}^\top, \dots, W_{k,N_r-T}^\top]^\top, \\ F_k &= [F_{k,1}^\top, F_{k,2}^\top, \dots, F_{k,T}^\top]^\top. \end{aligned}$$

where each  $W_{k,i}$ ,  $i \in [N_r - T]$ , and  $F_{k,j}$ ,  $j \in [T]$ , has  $l = \frac{L}{N_r - T}$  symbols. The message that user  $k$  uploads to helper node  $n$ , i.e.,  $X_{k,n}$ , is set as

$$\mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha_1 & \dots & \alpha_1^{N_r-1} \\ 1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_2^{N_r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_N & \dots & \alpha_N^{N_r-1} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [X_{k,1}, X_{k,2}, \dots, X_{k,N}]^\top \\ &= \mathbf{V} [W_{k,1}, W_{k,2}, \dots, W_{k,N_r-T}, F_{k,1}, F_{k,2}, \dots, F_{k,T}]^\top, \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in [N]$ , differs from each other over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

*Sharing and Computation Phase.* For  $n \in [N]$ , we set

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha_n & \dots & \alpha_n^{N_r-1} \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+1} & \dots & \alpha_{N+1}^{N_r-1} \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+2} & \dots & \alpha_{N+2}^{N_r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+N_r-1} & \dots & \alpha_{N+N_r-1}^{N_r-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+1} & \dots & \alpha_{N+1}^{N_r-2} \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+2} & \dots & \alpha_{N+2}^{N_r-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_{N+N_r-1} & \dots & \alpha_{N+N_r-1}^{N_r-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in [N + N_r - 1]$ , differs from each other over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in [N]$ , are the same as those used in (22). Consider  $NK(N_r - 1)$  i.i.d. uniform  $l \times 1$  vectors over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{l \times 1}$ , denoted as  $Q_{i,j}^{(k)}$ ,  $i \in [N]$ ,  $j \in [N_r - 1]$ . Then, for  $n \in [N]$  and  $k \in [K]$ , we define  $Z_{i,n}^{(k)}$  and  $M_{i,n}^{(k)}$ , which satisfy the equation in (26). Their explicit definitions are as follows.

As  $\mathbf{G}_n$  is a Vandermonde matrix of dimension  $N_r \times N_r$ , it is of full rank and invertible. Consequently, we can compute

$$\mathbf{S}_n = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{G}_n^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{S}_n \left[ \mathbf{G}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \right] \left[ W_{k,1}, W_{k,2}, \dots, W_{k,N_r-T}, F_{k,1}, F_{k,2}, \dots, F_{k,T}, Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^\top \\
&= \mathbf{V} \left[ W_{k,1}, W_{k,2}, \dots, W_{k,N_r-T}, F_{k,1}, F_{k,2}, \dots, F_{k,T} \right]^\top + \mathbf{S}_n \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \left[ Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^\top \\
&= [X_{k,1}, X_{k,2}, \dots, X_{k,N}]^\top + [Z_{1,n}^{(k)}, Z_{2,n}^{(k)}, \dots, Z_{N,n}^{(k)}]^\top = [M_{1,n}^{(k)}, M_{2,n}^{(k)}, \dots, M_{N,n}^{(k)}]^\top. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

The helper-side randomness of helper  $i$ , where  $i \in [N]$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i,n}^{(k)} &= \left( \mathbf{S}_n \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \left[ Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^\top \right)^\top \mathbf{e}_i^N, \\
&\quad \forall n \in [N], i \in [N], k \in [K], \text{ and} \\
Z_i &= \left( Z_{i,n}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in [N] \setminus \{i\}, k \in [K]}, \quad \forall i \in [N]. \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 1** From the definition of  $\mathbf{S}_n$ , i.e., (27), we note that the first element of the  $n$ -th row of  $\mathbf{S}_n$  is 1, and all other elements are 0, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{e}_n^N)^\top \mathbf{S}_n = (1, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (N_r-1)}).$$

As a result, we note that for any  $k \in [K]$  and any  $n \in [N]$ ,

$$\left( Z_{n,n}^{(k)} \right)^\top = (\mathbf{e}_n^N)^\top \mathbf{S}_n \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \left[ Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^\top = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times l}.$$

The message about user  $k$  sent from helper  $n$  to helper  $i$ , i.e.,  $M_{n,i}^{(k)}$ , is given by

$$M_{n,i}^{(k)} = X_{k,n} + Z_{n,i}^{(k)}, \quad \forall i \in [N] \setminus \{n\}, n \in [N], k \in [K].$$

Based on the pattern of the *user-to-helper* transmission, i.e.,  $\nu$ , for surviving helpers, i.e.,  $n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{n \rightarrow i}^\nu &= \left( M_{n,i}^{(k)} \right)_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n \cap ([K] \setminus \mathcal{K}_i)}, \\
&\quad \forall i \in [N] \setminus \{n\}, n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the helper  $n$ ,  $n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}$  computes  $\hat{X}_{k,n}$ ,  $k \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{K}_n$ , based on the received messages  $\mathcal{M}_n^\nu = \{M_{i \rightarrow n}^\nu\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \setminus \{n\}}$ , by following

$$\hat{X}_{k,n} = \left[ \left( M_{i,n}^{(k)} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right] \left( \mathbf{S}_n^\top \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right] \right)^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1^{N_r}, \tag{30}$$

where  $\mathcal{N}'_k$  can be any helper set such that  $\mathcal{N}'_k \subseteq \mathcal{N}_k, |\mathcal{N}'_k| = N_r$ .

**Remark 2** From the definition of  $\mathbf{S}_n$ , i.e., (27), we note that for any set  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq [N]$  such that  $|\mathcal{N}| \leq N_r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{rank} \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n \right) \\
&= \text{rank} \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \right]^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{G}_n^{-1} \right) = |\mathcal{N}|, \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where (31) follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{G}_n$  is an invertible  $N_r \times N_r$  matrix, and  $\mathbf{V}$  is a Vandermonde matrix of dimensions  $N \times N_r$ . Thus, we note that  $\text{rank} \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n \right) = N_r$ ,

which implies that  $\left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n$  is invertible.

Finally, we set

$$Y_n^\nu = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} X_{k,n} + \sum_{k \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{K}_n} \hat{X}_{k,n}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}. \tag{32}$$

*Proof of Correctness:* Based on the calculation of  $\hat{X}_{k,n}^\top$  (see (30)), for any  $k \in [K]$  and  $n \in [N]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{X}_{k,n}^\top &= \left[ \mathbf{e}_1^{N_r} \right]^\top \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n \right)^{-1} \left[ \left( M_{i,n}^{(k)} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \\
&= \left[ \mathbf{e}_1^{N_r} \right]^\top \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \left( \left[ (\mathbf{e}_i^N)_{i \in \mathcal{N}'_k} \right]^\top \mathbf{S}_n \left[ \mathbf{G}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left[ \left( W_{k,i} \right)_{i \in [N_r-T]}, \left( F_{k,i} \right)_{i \in [T]}, \left( Q_{n,i}^{(k)} \right)_{i \in [N_r-1]} \right]^\top \right) \tag{33a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left[ \mathbf{e}_1^{N_r} \right]^\top \left[ \mathbf{G}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \right] \\
&\quad \left[ \left( W_{k,i} \right)_{i \in [N_r-T]}, \left( F_{k,i} \right)_{i \in [T]}, \left( Q_{n,i}^{(k)} \right)_{i \in [N_r-1]} \right]^\top \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N_r-T} \alpha_n^{i-1} W_{k,i}^\top + \sum_{i=N_r-T+1}^{N_r} \alpha_n^{i-1} F_{k,i-N_r+T}^\top \tag{33b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= X_{k,n}^\top, \tag{33c}$$

where (33a) follows from (26), (33b) follows from (24) and (25), and (33c) follows from (22) and (23).

Substituting the result of (33c) into (32), we have

$$Y_n^\nu = \sum_{k=1}^K X_{k,n}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}. \tag{34}$$

For any  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \subseteq [N]$  such that  $|\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}| \geq N_r$ , the master chooses  $N_r$  different  $Y_n^\nu$  from received messages  $Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^\nu$ . As any square sub-matrix of a Vandermonde matrix has full rank, the master can recover  $\left( \sum_{k=1}^K W_{k,i} \right)_{i \in [N_r-T]}$  by using  $N_r$  different  $Y_n^\nu$ . By combining these results, the master can recover  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$ .

*Security Against Helpers:* To provide a proof of security, we begin by presenting some useful properties of the messages defined above in the following lemmas.

The following lemma presents some independence properties of the helper-side randomnesses, with its proof deferred to Subsection IV-C.

**Lemma 1** For the random variables defined in (28), for any helper set  $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq [N] \setminus \{n\}$ , we have

$$H \left( \left( Z_{\mathcal{S}_n, n}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in [N], k \in [K]} \right) = \sum_{n \in [N], k \in [K]} H \left( Z_{\mathcal{S}_n, n}^{(k)} \right). \quad (35a)$$

Furthermore, if  $|\mathcal{S}_n| \leq N_r - 1$ , then  $Z_{\mathcal{S}_n, n}^{(k)}$  contains  $|\mathcal{S}_n|$  i.i.d. uniform variables, i.e.,

$$H \left( Z_{\mathcal{S}_n, n}^{(k)} \right) = |\mathcal{S}_n| l = \frac{L|\mathcal{S}_n|}{N_r - T}. \quad (35b)$$

The following lemma shows that transmission between helpers won't leak any user-to-helper messages other than those that the helpers are supposed to receive. The proof of Lemma 2 relies on the result of Lemma 1, and is deferred to Subsection IV-D.

**Lemma 2** For any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$  where  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , and any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , we have

$$I \left( X_{[K], [N]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) = 0.$$

Armed with Lemmas 1 and 2, we now present the proof of security against helpers. First, consider the security after the users uploading phase. For any  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq [K]$ , and any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$  where  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\ & \leq I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, \left( Q_{[N], [N_r - 1]}^{(k)} \right)_{k \in [K]} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (36a)$$

$$= I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \quad (36b)$$

$$= H \left( X_{[K], \mathcal{T}} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) - H \left( X_{[K], \mathcal{T}} | W_{[K]}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = H \left( X_{[K] \setminus \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\ & \quad - H \left( \left( \sum_{i=N_r - T + 1}^{N_r} \alpha_n^{i-1} F_{k, i - N_r + T}^{\top} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}, k \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{U}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (36c)$$

$$\leq \frac{(K - |\mathcal{U}|)|\mathcal{T}|L}{N_r - T} - \frac{(K - |\mathcal{U}|)|\mathcal{T}|L}{N_r - T} = 0, \quad (36d)$$

where (36a) follows from the fact that  $Z_{n, [N] \setminus \{n\}}^{(k)}$ ,  $n \in \mathcal{T}$ , are functions of  $Q_{[N], [N_r - 1]}^{(k)}$ , (36b) follows from the fact that  $Q_{[N], [N_r - 1]}^{(k)}$  are independent of  $(W_{[K]}, F_{\mathcal{U}}, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}})$ , (36c) follows from the design of  $X_{k, n}$ , i.e., (23), and the fact that  $F_k$ ,  $k \in [K]$ , are mutually independent, the first term of (36d) follows from the fact that each  $X_{k, n}$  has  $\frac{L}{N_r - T}$  symbols, and the uniform distribution maximizes entropy, and the second term of (36d) follows from the fact that any submatrix of a Vandermonde matrix has full rank, and that  $F_k$ ,  $k \in [K]$ , are i.i.d. uniform random variables.

Finally, for any  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq [K]$ , any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$  where  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , and any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\ & = I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\ & \quad + I \left( W_{[K]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 0 + I \left( X_{[K], [N]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \quad (37a)$$

$$\leq I \left( X_{[K], [N]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) \quad (37b)$$

$$= 0, \quad (37c)$$

where the first term of (37a) follows from (36d), the second term of (37a) follows from the fact that  $W_{[K]}$  can be decoded from  $X_{[K], [N]}$  (see (23)), (37b) follows from the fact that  $W_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $F_{\mathcal{U}}$  can be decoded from  $X_{[K], [N]}$  (see (23)), and (37c) follows from Lemma 2. Since mutual information is greater than or equal to zero, from (37c), the proof of (10) is thus complete.

*Security Against the Master:* We now prove that the above scheme guarantees security against the master, i.e., (11). Consider  $\mathcal{T}_0$  where  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_0$  and  $|\mathcal{T}_0| = T$ . Thus, for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & H \left( Y_{[N]}^{\nu} | W, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}_0} \right) \\ & = H \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^K X_{k, n} \right)_{n \in [N]} \left| \sum_{k=1}^K W_k, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}_0} \right. \right) \end{aligned} \quad (38a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq H \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=N_r - T + 1}^{N_r} \alpha_n^{i-1} F_{k, i + T - N_r}^{\top} \right)_{n \in [N]} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left| \sum_{k=1}^K W_k, \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=N_r - T + 1}^{N_r} \alpha_n^{i-1} F_{k, i + T - N_r}^{\top} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}_0} \right. \right) \end{aligned} \quad (38b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq H \left( \left( \sum_{i=N_r - T + 1}^{N_r} \left( \alpha_n^{i-1} \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k, i + T - N_r}^{\top} \right) \right)_{n \in [N]} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left| \left( \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k, i + T - N_r}^{\top} \right)_{i \in [N_r - T + 1: N_r]} \right. \right) \end{aligned} \quad (38c)$$

$$= 0, \quad (38d)$$

where (38a) follows from (34), (38b) follows from the design of  $X_{k, n}$ , i.e., (23), and (38c) follows from the fact that  $\left( \sum_{i=N_r - T + 1}^{N_r} \left( \alpha_n^{i-1} \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k, i + T - N_r}^{\top} \right) \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}_0}$  contains  $T$  linearly independent linear combinations of  $\sum_{k=1}^K F_{k, i}$ ,  $i \in [T]$ , from which  $\sum_{k=1}^K F_{k, i}$ ,  $i \in [T]$  can be decoded.

Armed with (38d), the proof of (11) can be easily derived from the result of (10). More specifically, for any  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq [K]$ , any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$  where  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , and any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I \left( W_{[K]}; Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}}}^{\nu}, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | W, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\ & \leq I \left( W_{[K]}; Y_{[N]}^{\nu}, X_{[K], \mathcal{T}_0}, Z_{\mathcal{T}_0}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}_0}^{\nu} | W, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (39a)$$

$$= I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}_0}, Z_{\mathcal{T}_0}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}_0}^{\nu} | W, W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \quad (39b)$$

$$\leq I \left( W_{[K]}; X_{[K], \mathcal{T}_0}, Z_{\mathcal{T}_0}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}_0}^{\nu} | W_{\mathcal{U}}, F_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \quad (39c)$$

$$\leq 0, \quad (39d)$$

where (39a) follows from  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{UH}} \subseteq [N]$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_0$ , (39b) follows from (38d), (39c) follows from  $W$  is a function of  $W_{[K]}$ , and (39d) follows from the validity of (10) in the case where  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_0$ . Since mutual information is greater than or equal to zero, from (39d), the proof of (11) is thus complete.

*Rate:* From the design of  $X_{k,n}$  and  $Y_n^\nu$ , i.e., (23) and (32), we note that  $L_X = L_Y = l = \frac{L}{N_r - T}$ . As a result, we have  $(R_X, R_Y) = \left(\frac{1}{N_r - T}, \frac{1}{N_r - T}\right)$

**Remark 3** *In the proof above, we note that the independence and uniformity of the vectors  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_K$  are not utilized, neither in the proof of correctness nor in the two security proofs. Thus, the rate tuple  $(R_X, R_Y) = \left(\frac{1}{N_r - T}, \frac{1}{N_r - T}\right)$  is achievable for  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_K$  with arbitrary distributions.*

Hence, the proof of achievability is complete, provided that we prove Lemmas 1 and 2, which will be established next.

### C. Proof of Lemma 1

First, consider (35a). Since for any  $k \in [K]$  and any  $n \in [N]$ ,  $\left(Z_{i,n}^{(k)}\right)_{i \in [N] \setminus \{n\}}$  is a function of  $Q_{n,[N_r-1]}^{(k)}$ , and  $Q_{n,[N_r-1]}^{(k)}$ ,  $k \in [K]$ ,  $n \in [N]$ , are i.i.d. uniform variables,  $Z_{[N] \setminus \{n\},n}^{(k)}$ ,  $k \in [K]$ ,  $n \in [N]$ , are mutually independent. Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq [N] \setminus \{n\}$ , the proof of (35a) is thus completed.

Next, consider (35b). For any  $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq [N] \setminus \{n\}$  such that  $|\mathcal{S}_n| \leq N_r - 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \left( Z_{i,n}^{(k)} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n} \right]^T \\ &= \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \left[ Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^T \quad (40a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^{N_r} \right)_{i \in [2:N_r]} \right] \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^{N_r} \right)_{i \in [2:N_r]} \right]^T \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \\ & \quad \left[ Q_{n,1}^{(k)}, Q_{n,2}^{(k)}, \dots, Q_{n,N_r-1}^{(k)} \right]^T, \quad (40b) \end{aligned}$$

where (40a) follows from the definition of  $Z_{i,n}^{(k)}$ , i.e., (28), (40b) follows from the fact that the first line of  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  is all zero.

By setting  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{S}_n \cup \{n\}$  in (31), we have

$$\text{rank} \left( \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n \cup \{n\}} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n \right) = |\mathcal{S}_n| + 1,$$

which implies that  $\left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n \cup \{n\}} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n$  is full rank. From Remark 1, we have  $\left( \mathbf{e}_n^N \right)^T \mathbf{S}_n = (1, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (N_r-1)})$ . Thus,  $\left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^{N_r} \right)_{i \in [2:N_r]} \right]$  can be seen as a submatrix of  $\mathbf{S}_n$  and has full rank, i.e.,

$$\text{rank} \left( \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^N \right)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_n} \right]^T \mathbf{S}_n \left[ \left( \mathbf{e}_i^{N_r} \right)_{i \in [2:N_r]} \right] \right) = |\mathcal{S}_n|. \quad (41)$$

By combining the results of (40b) and (41), we note that  $Z_{\mathcal{S}_n,n}^{(k)}$  contains  $|\mathcal{S}_n|$  linearly independent linear combinations of  $Q_{n,[N_r-1]}^{(k)}$ . Since  $Q_{n,[N_r-1]}^{(k)}$  contains  $N_r - 1$  i.i.d. uniform  $l \times 1$  vectors over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{l \times 1}$ , we have

$$H \left( Z_{\mathcal{S}_n,n}^{(k)} \right) = |\mathcal{S}_n| l = \frac{|\mathcal{S}_n| L}{N_r - T}.$$

The proof of Lemma 1 is thus complete.

### D. Proof of Lemma 2

For any  $k \in [K]$ , any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$ ,  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_k = \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{N}_k$ . Then, for any  $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$ , consider the messages between helpers used to recover  $X_{k,t}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & H \left( M_{\mathcal{N}_k,t}^{(k)} \middle| X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) \\ & \leq H \left( \left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k} \middle| \left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}} \right) \quad (42a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = H \left( \left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k \cup \mathcal{T}} \right) \\ & \quad - H \left( X_{k,t}, \left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\}} \right) \quad (42b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq H(X_{k,t}) + (N_r - 1)l - H(X_{k,t}) \\ & \quad - H \left( \left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\}} \middle| X_{k,[N]} \right) \quad (42c) \end{aligned}$$

$$= (N_r - 1)l - (|\mathcal{T}| - 1)l = (N_r - |\mathcal{T}|)l, \quad (42d)$$

where (42a) follows from the design of  $M_{n,i}^{(k)}$ , i.e., (29), and the fact that  $\left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}}$  can be determined by  $X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}$  and  $Z_{\mathcal{T}}$  (see (28) and Remark 1), (42b) follows from  $Z_{t,t}^{(k)} = \mathbf{0}_{l \times 1}$ , (42c) follows from the fact that  $\left( X_{k,n} + Z_{n,t}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in [N]}$  contains at most  $N_r$  different linear combinations of  $W_{k,[N_r-T]}$ ,  $F_{k,[T]}$ , and  $Q_{t,[N_r-1]}^{(k)}$ , one of which is  $X_{k,t}$ , and the message length of each linear combination is  $l$  (see (26)), and (42d) follows from Lemma 1, more specifically,  $H \left( Z_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\},t}^{(k)} \right) = (|\mathcal{T}| - 1)l$ .

Finally, for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(N_r)$ , and any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$ ,  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I \left( X_{[K],[N]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu \middle| X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) \\ & = H \left( \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu \middle| X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) - H \left( \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu \middle| X_{[K],[N]}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k} H \left( M_{\mathcal{N}_k,t}^{(k)} \middle| X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \quad - H \left( \left( Z_{\mathcal{N}_k,\mathcal{T}_k}^{(k)} \right)_{k \in [K]} \middle| \left( Z_{n,[N] \setminus \{n\}}^{(k)} \right)_{n \in \mathcal{T}, k \in [K]} \right) \quad (43a) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} |\mathcal{T}_k| (N_r - |\mathcal{T}|)l - \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k} H \left( Z_{\mathcal{N}_k,t}^{(k)} \middle| Z_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\},t}^{(k)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \sum_{k \in [K]} |\mathcal{T}_k| (N_r - |\mathcal{T}|)l \\ & \quad - \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k} \left( H \left( Z_{\mathcal{N}_k \cup \mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\},t}^{(k)} \right) - H \left( Z_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\},t}^{(k)} \right) \right) \\ & = \sum_{k \in [K]} |\mathcal{T}_k| (N_r - |\mathcal{T}|)l - \sum_{k \in [K]} |\mathcal{T}_k| (N_r - |\mathcal{T}|)l \quad (43c) \\ & = 0, \quad (43d) \end{aligned}$$

where (43a) follows from the design of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^\nu$  and  $Z_{\mathcal{T}}$ , i.e., (29) and (28), and the fact that  $\left( Z_{\mathcal{N}_k,\mathcal{T}_k}^{(k)} \right)_{k \in [K]}$  is independent of  $X_{[K],[N]}$ , the first term of (43b) follows from (42d), the second term of (43b) follows from (35a), and (43c) follows from (35b).



Since mutual information is greater than or equal to zero, from (43d), we have

$$I(X_{[K],[N]}; \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\nu} | X_{[K],\mathcal{T}}, Z_{\mathcal{T}}) = 0,$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is thus complete.

## V. CONVERSE PROOF

In this section, we provide the converse proof of Theorem 1. The proof is divided into two cases:  $N_r \leq T$  and  $N_r > T$ . For the case  $N_r \leq T$ , we prove that no achievable scheme exists. For the case  $N_r > T$ , we derive the lower bounds for the communication rates from the user to the helper and from the helper to the master, respectively.

### A. $N_r \leq T$ : Proof of $\mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset$

When  $N_r \leq T$ , a contradiction arises between the security constraints and the correctness constraint. To derive this contradiction, we consider the case  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} = [N_r]$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ . Since  $N_r \leq T \leq N$ , the choice of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}$  is feasible. When  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} = [N_r]$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ , from the security constraint against helpers, i.e., (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= I(W_{[K]}; X_{[K],[N_r]}, Z_{[N_r]}, \mathcal{M}_{[N_r]}^{\nu}) \\ &\geq I(W; Y_{[N_r]}^{\nu}) \end{aligned} \quad (44a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= H(W) - H(W | Y_{[N_r]}^{\nu}) \\ &= L - 0 = L, \end{aligned} \quad (44b)$$

where (44a) follows from the fact that  $Y_{[N_r]}^{\nu}$  can be determined by  $X_{[K],[N_r]}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{[N_r]}^{\nu}$ , and  $Z_{[N_r]}$  (see (8)), and that  $W$  is a function of  $W_{[K]}$ , the first term of (44b) follows from the fact that  $W_{[K]}$  consists of  $K$  i.i.d. random vectors, each uniformly distributed on  $\mathbb{F}_q^{L \times 1}$ , and that  $W$  is a linear combination of  $W_{[K]}$ , and the second term of (44b) follows from the correctness constraint, i.e., (9).

Thus, we arrive at a contradiction, i.e.,  $0 \geq L$ . As a result, there is no achievable scheme, i.e.,  $\mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset$ . The proof of  $\mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset$  is thus complete.

### B. $N_r > T$ : Proof of $R_X \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}$

In this subsection, for the case  $N_r > T$ , we derive the lower bound for the communication rate of the user-to-helper transmission.

We start with the following lemma, which shows that the local gradient of user  $k$  can be recovered from all the messages successfully transmitted by user  $k$ .

**Lemma 3** For any  $k \in [K]$  and  $\mathcal{N}_k \subseteq [N]$  such that  $|\mathcal{N}_k| \geq N_r$ , we have

$$I(W_k; X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}) = L.$$

*Proof:* From the correctness constraint, i.e., (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= H(W | Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}) \geq H(W | Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}) \\ &= H(W_k | Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}) \end{aligned} \quad (45a)$$

$$\geq H(W_k | (X_{\mathcal{K}_n,n})_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}, Z_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}) \quad (45b)$$

$$\geq H(W_k | (X_{\mathcal{K}_n,n})_{n \in [N]}, Z_{[N]}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}) \quad (45c)$$

$$\geq H(W_k | X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}, Z_{[N]}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}, F_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}) \quad (45d)$$

$$= H(W_k | X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}), \quad (45e)$$

where (45a) follows from  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$ , (45b) follows from the fact that  $Y_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}$  can be determined by  $(X_{\mathcal{K}_n,n})_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}$ ,  $Z_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}$  (see (8)), (45c) follows from  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} \subseteq [N]$ , and the fact that  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}}}^{\nu}$  can be determined by  $(X_{\mathcal{K}_n,n})_{n \in [N]}$  and  $Z_{[N]}$  (see (7)), (45d) follows from the fact that  $(X_{i,\mathcal{N}_i})_{i \in [K] \setminus \{k\}}$  can be determined by  $W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}$  and  $F_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}$  (see (3)), and (45e) follows from the fact that  $X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}$  is a function of  $W_k$  and  $F_k$ , and that  $(W_k, F_k)$  is independent of  $(Z_{[N]}, W_{[K] \setminus \{k\}}, F_{[K] \setminus \{k\}})$ . Thus, we have

$$I(W_k; X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}) = H(W_k) - H(W_k | X_{k,\mathcal{N}_k}) = L,$$

where the last step follows from the assumption that  $W_k$  is a  $L \times 1$  uniform vector, i.e., (2). ■

The above lemma is a consequence of the correctness constraint. Furthermore, consider the security against helpers constraint, then for any  $k \in [K]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &I(W_k; X_{k,[T]}) \\ &\leq I(W_{[K]}; X_{[K],[T]}, \mathcal{M}_{[T]}^{\nu}, Z_{[T]}) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where (46) follows from (10) with  $\mathcal{T} = [T]$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ .

Armed with Lemma 3 and (46), consider  $\mathcal{N}_k = [N_r]$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} L &= I(W_k; X_{k,[N_r]}) \\ &= I(W_k; X_{k,[T]}) + I(W_k; X_{k,[N_r] \setminus [T]} | X_{k,[T]}) \\ &= I(W_k; X_{k,[N_r] \setminus [T]} | X_{k,[T]}) \\ &\leq H(X_{k,[N_r] \setminus [T]}) \leq \sum_{n \in [N_r] \setminus [T]} H(X_{k,n}) \\ &\leq (N_r - T)L_X, \end{aligned} \quad (47a) \quad (47b)$$

where (47a) follows from (46), and (47b) follows from the fact that each  $X_{k,n}$  contains at most  $L_X$  symbols.

Thus, following from the definition of  $R_X$ , we have

$$R_X = \frac{L_X}{L} \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}.$$

The proof of  $R_X \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}$  when  $N_r > T$  is thus complete.

### C. $N_r > T$ : Proof of $R_2 \geq \frac{N_r}{N_r - T}$

In this subsection, for the case  $N_r > T$ , we derive the lower bound for the communication rate of the helper-to-master transmission.

Consider  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{EH}} = \mathcal{N}_{\text{HM}} = [N_r]$ , then we have

$$L = H(W) \quad (48a)$$

$$= H(W) - H(W | Y_{[N_r]}^{\nu}) = I(W; Y_{[N_r]}^{\nu}) \quad (48b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= I(W; Y_{[T]}^{\nu}) + I(W; Y_{[N_r] \setminus [T]}^{\nu} | Y_{[T]}^{\nu}) \\ &\leq 0 + H(Y_{[N_r] \setminus [T]}^{\nu}) \end{aligned} \quad (48c)$$

$$\leq \sum_{n \in [N_r] \setminus [T]} H(Y_n^\nu) \leq (N_r - T)L_Y, \quad (48d)$$

where (48a) follows from  $W = \sum_{k=1}^K W_k$  and the assumption that  $W_{[K]}$  are  $K$  i.i.d.  $L \times 1$  uniform vectors, (48b) follows from the correctness constraint, i.e., (9), (48c) follows from the security against helpers, more specifically, by setting  $\mathcal{T} = [T]$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{EH}} = [N_r]$  in (10), and (48d) follows from the fact that each  $Y_n^\nu$  contains at most  $L_Y$  symbols.

Thus, following from the definition of  $R_Y$ , we have

$$R_Y = \frac{L_Y}{L} \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}.$$

The proof of  $R_Y \geq \frac{1}{N_r - T}$  when  $N_r > T$  is thus complete.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We propose and study a hierarchical secure coded gradient aggregation problem, where users communicate with the master through an intermediate layer of helpers that can communicate with each other. For straggling communication links with a resiliency threshold of  $N_r$ , the goal of the server is to recover the sum of all user gradients. With at most  $T$  colluding helpers and any number of colluding users, the security constraints require that no information about  $W_{[K]}$  is leaked beyond what is already known by the colluding users, or what is contained in the required sum. We propose an achievable scheme along with a matching converse bound, demonstrating that secure aggregation is infeasible when  $N_r \leq T$ , whereas when  $N_r > T$ , both the user-to-helper and helper-to-master optimal communication rates are  $\frac{1}{N_r - T}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y. Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 54. PMLR, April 20–22 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [2] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50–60, 2020.
- [3] L. Zhu, Z. Liu, and S. Han, "Deep leakage from gradients," in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 32, 2019, pp. 1–11.
- [4] K. Bonawitz, V. Ivanov, B. Kreuter, A. Marcedone, and K. Seth, "Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning," in the *2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference*, 2017.
- [5] J. So, C. He, C.-S. Yang, S. Li, Q. Yu, R. E. Ali, B. Güler, and S. Avestimehr, "Lightsecagg: a lightweight and versatile design for secure aggregation in federated learning," *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, vol. 4, pp. 694–720, 2022.
- [6] J. So, B. Güler, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Turbo-aggregate: Breaking the quadratic aggregation barrier in secure federated learning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 479–489, 2021.
- [7] Y. Zhao and H. Sun, "Information theoretic secure aggregation with user dropouts," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 7471–7484, 2022.
- [8] T. Jahani-Nezhad, M. A. Maddah-Ali, S. Li, and G. Caire, "Swiftagg: Communication-efficient and dropout-resistant secure aggregation for federated learning with worst-case security guarantees," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2022, pp. 103–108.
- [9] —, "Swiftagg+: Achieving asymptotically optimal communication loads in secure aggregation for federated learning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 977–989, 2023.
- [10] Y. Zhao and H. Sun, "Secure summation: Capacity region, groupwise key, and feasibility," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 1376–1387, 2024.
- [11] K. Wan, X. Yao, H. Sun, M. Ji, and G. Caire, "On the information theoretic secure aggregation with uncoded groupwise keys," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 9, pp. 6596–6619, 2024.
- [12] K. Wan, H. Sun, M. Ji, T. Mi, and G. Caire, "The capacity region of information theoretic secure aggregation with uncoded groupwise keys," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 10, pp. 6932–6949, 2024.
- [13] J. So, R. E. Ali, B. Güler, J. Jiao, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Securing secure aggregation: Mitigating multi-round privacy leakage in federated learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 8, 2023, pp. 9864–9873.
- [14] J. So, R. E. Ali, B. Güler, and A. Salman Avestimehr, "Secure Aggregation for Buffered Asynchronous Federated Learning," *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2110.02177, Oct. 2021.
- [15] J. Nguyen, K. Malik, H. Zhan, A. Yousefpour, M. Rabbat, M. Malek, and D. Huba, "Federated learning with buffered asynchronous aggregation," in *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, G. Camps-Valls, F. J. R. Ruiz, and I. Valera, Eds., vol. 151. PMLR, 28–30 Mar 2022, pp. 3581–3607. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/nguyen22b.html>
- [16] K. Swanand, R. Nived, K. Onur, Ozan, and R. Kannan, "Fastsecagg: Scalable secure aggregation for privacy-preserving federated learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2009.11248, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.11248>
- [17] B. Choi, J.-y. Sohn, D.-J. Han, and J. Moon, "Communication-Efficient Secure Aggregation for Federated Learning," *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2012.05433, Dec. 2020.
- [18] A. R. Elkordy and A. S. Avestimehr, "Heterosag: Secure aggregation with heterogeneous quantization in federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 2372–2386, 2022.
- [19] J. H. Bell, K. A. Bonawitz, A. Gascón, T. Lepoint, and M. Raykova, "Secure single-server aggregation with (poly)logarithmic overhead," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 1253–1269. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3372297.3417885>
- [20] H. Us Sami and B. Güler, "Secure gradient aggregation with sparsification for resource-limited federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 72, no. 11, pp. 6883–6899, 2024.
- [21] L. Liu, J. Zhang, S. Song, and K. B. Letaief, "Client-edge-cloud hierarchical federated learning," in *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [22] L. Luo, C. Zhang, H. Yu, G. Sun, S. Luo, and S. Dustdar, "Communication-efficient federated learning with adaptive aggregation for heterogeneous client-edge-cloud network," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [23] J. Wang, S. Wang, R.-R. Chen, and M. Ji, "Demystifying why local aggregation helps: Convergence analysis of hierarchical sgd," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 8, 2022, pp. 8548–8556.
- [24] X. Chen, G. Zhu, Y. Deng, and Y. Fang, "Federated learning over multi-hop wireless networks with in-network aggregation," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 4622–4634, 2022.
- [25] W. Tang, J. Li, L. Chen, and X. Chen, "Design and optimization of hierarchical gradient coding for distributed learning at edge devices," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [26] S. Prakash, A. Reiszadeh, R. Pedarsani, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Hierarchical coded gradient aggregation for learning at the edge," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2020, pp. 2616–2621.
- [27] K. Liang and Y. Wu, "Two-layer coded gradient aggregation with straggling communication links," in *2020 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [28] B. Sasidharan and A. Thomas, "Coded gradient aggregation: A tradeoff between communication costs at edge nodes and at helper nodes," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2286–2291.
- [29] M. N. Krishnan, A. Thomas, and B. Sasidharan, "Hierarchical coded gradient aggregation based on layered mds codes," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 2547–2552.
- [30] M. Egger, C. Hofmeister, A. Wachter-Zeh, and R. Bitar, "Private aggregation in wireless federated learning with heterogeneous clusters,"

in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 54–59.

- [31] —, “Private aggregation in hierarchical wireless federated learning with partial and full collusion,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.14088>
- [32] X. Zhang, K. Wan, H. Sun, S. Wang, M. Ji, and G. Caire, “Optimal communication and key rate region for hierarchical secure aggregation with user collusion,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.14035>
- [33] O. Tavalalaie, K. Thilakarathna, S. Seneviratne, A. Seneviratne, and A. Y. Zomaya, “Shfl: Secure hierarchical federated learning framework for edge networks,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15067>