The Distributed Multi-User Point Function

Ali Khalesi
Communicaiotn System Department
Eurecom Institute
Biot, France
Email:ali.khalesi@eurecom.fr

Bahareh Akhbari
K.N.Toosi University
Tehran
Email: akhbari@kntu.ac.ir

***Abstract*—In this paper, we study the problem of information-theoretic distributed multi-user point function, involving a trusted master node, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ server nodes, and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ users, where each user has access to the contents of a subset of the storages of server nodes. Each user is associated with an independent point function $f_{X_k,Z_k} : \{1,2,\ldots,T\} \rightarrow GF(q^{mR_k}), T, mR_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Using these point functions, the trusted master node encodes and places functional shares $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_N \in GF(q^M), M \in \mathbb{N}$ in the storage nodes such that each user can correctly recover its point function result from the response transmitted to itself and gains no information about the point functions of any other user, even with knowledge of all responses transmitted from its connected servers. For the first time, we propose a multi-user scheme that satisfies the correctness and information-theoretic privacy constraints, ensuring recovery for all point functions. We also characterize the inner and outer bounds on the capacity—the maximum achievable rate defined as the size of the range of each point function mR_k relative to the storage size of the servers M—of the distributed multi-user point function scheme by presenting a novel converse argument.**
Keywords: ***Distributed Point Function, Distributed Systems, Multi-User Secrecy, Multi-USer Secret Sharing***

I. Introduction

The new information era is marked by the extensive use of distributed systems for storing and processing large amounts of data, enabled by cloud computing, blockchain technology, and distributed learning and storage services. The distributed nature of these services, along with their support for multiple users, makes security and privacy concerns among the most critical challenges we face. Users of cloud services expect their data to be secure and private, ensuring that only the intended recipient can access it. On the other hand, service providers aim to design efficient algorithms that reduce memory requirements, communication overhead, delays, and processing computational costs. To respond properly to these issues many cryptographic primitives or building blocks have undergone further studies to characterize their fundamental limits and to improve with regards to storage [1]–[4], communication [5]–[12], computation [13]–[21], and precision [22], [23] (for more studies we refer to [24]).

One of the most important cryptographic primitives is the secret-sharing schemes, which allows a dealer to split a secret into multiple shares, ensuring that only specific authorized subsets of these shares can collaboratively reconstruct the secret, while unauthorized subsets gain no information about it, thereby guaranteeing information-theoretic security [25]–[29]. The standard notion of secret sharing has been extended from two points of view, one regarding the secret content (qualitatively) another regarding the number of secrets (quantitatively). The first point of view results in the introduction of *function secret sharing* schemes [30]. In that framework, a function f is divided into r succinctly described function shares $f_1, \ldots, f_r$, such that any subset of t shares reveals no information about f. The scheme supports the additive reconstruction of f's values at a point x over a fixed Abelian group, satisfying $f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x)$. More concretely, each function share f_i is represented by a compact key k_i, such that, for the appropriate evaluation algorithm Eval_i, it holds that $\text{Eval}_i(k_i, x) = f_i(x)$. The efficiency of function secret-sharing schemes is typically evaluated based on the total size of the keys (storage cost) and the communication load.

Function secret sharing, like many cryptographic concepts, can achieve privacy either through computational hardness assumptions, leading to *computational privacy*, or by avoiding such assumptions to ensure *information-theoretic privacy*. While most existing function secret-sharing schemes are computationally private and primarily designed for two-server setups, modern distributed systems increasingly favor multi-server configurations [31]. Information-theoretic distributed point functions (DPFs) [32] offer significant advantages, as they can tolerate computationally unbounded servers and provide superior computational efficiency. These

properties make them particularly well-suited for constructing efficient cryptographic protocols, including private information retrieval (PIR) [33] and distributed key generation (DKG) [34].

The first information-theoretic function secret-sharing (FSS) schemes were introduced in [35], [36]. Luo et al. [35] proposed three constructions for point functions $f_{X,Z}$, including non-linear and linear (non-additive) reconstruction methods. In [35], the focus shifted to single-point functions and their multi-point extensions using key concatenation, relying on private information retrieval (PIR) protocols for reconstruction. Due to the increased complexity of non-additive reconstruction [35], communication and storage complexity became a key metric [32], [35]–[38]. In [32], via query conversion of two-server PIR a scheme with sub-polynomial communication and a non-linear retrieval algorithm is introduced. Later, in [37], the result were extended to an eight-server scheme and a four-server scheme with various key sizes. Also the authors of [37] put forth a $d(r+1)$-server r-private information-theoretically secure function secret-sharing schemes for general point functions $f_{X,Z}$ with $Z \in \mathbb{Z}_q, X \in \{1, \ldots, T\}$ and key size $O(\log(q) \cdot T^{1/\lfloor (2d-1)/r \rfloor})$ for any prime number q and integer $T, d \geq 1$. In [38], based on the results of [32], [37], a novel verifiable information-theoretic secure scheme is presented that can work on an arbitrary number of servers, multi-point, and comparison functions by using a polynomial-based PIR scheme.

From the quantitative point of view towards secret sharing protocols, that scheme has been extended to multi-user or multi-secret sharing [2], [39], where the basic secret sharing schemes can share only one secret in a single sharing process. Hence, if we want to share k secrets, the entire sharing process must be repeated k times, which generates k shares. It significantly increases communication and storage overhead. The first distributed multi-secret or multi-user secret sharing (DMUSS) scheme was introduced by Soleymani and Mahdavifar in [2]. A typical DMUSS setting includes a dealer, N storage nodes, and K users. Each user has access to a specific subset of storage nodes, from which they can download data to reconstruct their desired secret.

Some DMUSS protocols operate under weak secrecy conditions, ensuring that each user gains no information about the individual secrets of others. Others ensure perfect secrecy, where a user gains no information about the collective secrets of all other users. The capacity of DMUSS was characterized in [1], which introduced an optimal scheme capable of handling arbitrary access structures. This scheme maximizes the user's rate, defined as the size of each secret relative to the storage size of each user, while ensuring the weak secrecy condition. It is worth mentioning that under the perfect privacy condition, the capacity has been characterized in [40].

Following the foundational work of [2], numerous studies have advanced the field. Recent advancements in distributed multi-user secret sharing (DMUSS) and secure storage systems have significantly expanded their theoretical and practical scope. Research has explored the capacity region of DMUSS under perfect secrecy, with efficient schemes ensuring privacy and optimized rates for multi-user setups [41]. Enhanced protocols have been proposed for graph-based secret sharing, emphasizing efficiency, flexibility, and adaptability in evolving systems [42], [43]. Novel approaches address weak secrecy conditions and multi-secret scenarios, leveraging mathematical frameworks like correlated random variables and graph-theoretic models [44]–[46]. Bounds and constructions for symmetric and multilevel secret sharing schemes have been established, optimizing share sizes and security guarantees [47], [48]. Collectively, these studies provide robust solutions for distributed data management, balancing secrecy, efficiency, and adaptability in dynamic environments, while setting the stage for applications in secure storage, computation, and distributed systems.

In this paper, for the first time, we introduce the problem of the distributed multi-point function (DMUPF) that synthesizes multi-user secret sharing and information-theoretic distributed point function into one protocol. The scheme is composed of a master node or dealer, N server nodes with storage of size M q-ary and K users where each user is connected through some error-free and secure links to a subset of servers $\mathcal{A}_k$. At the end of the scheme, each user has to be able to correctly get the result of its point function $f_{X_k,Z_k} : \{1, 2, \ldots, T\} \to GF(q^{mR_k})$[1], where q is a prime number and $m, R_K \in \mathbb{R}, mR_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that no user can statistically get any information from the other user's point function by knowing the common functional shares accessed via the common servers. In particular, the scheme is composed of four phases, namely, the placement, demand, evaluation and, retrieval phases. In the placement phase the master node, having known all the information about every single user, generates N functional shares

[1]We remind that $f_{X_k,Z_k}(.)$ is a mapping that has one element which the $\{(X_k, Z_k)\}$. We supposed that X_k, Z_K are full-entropy random variables on their domain.

or keys $G_n \in GF(q^M), n \in \{1,\dots,N\}$ and places them in their associated server. Then in the demand phase, each user sends their input demand value $V_k \in \{1,\dots,T\}, k \in \{1,\dots,K\}$ to all the connected servers, and then each server for each user generates a response $C_{k,n} \in \mathbf{GF}(q^{mR_k}),\ k \in \{1,\dots,K\}, n \in \{1,\dots,N\}$ and in the retrieval phase each user gets its desired point function result $f_{X_k,Z_k(V_K)}$ by performing only some linear additive summation (Correctness condition). The scheme guarantees that each user can not get any information about the other user's point function. The scheme's design results from observing a deep connection between polynomial PIR and Shamir's Secret Sharing method, DMUSS and information-theoretic secure distributed point function. In summary, we utilized novel mapping functions introduced in Lemma 5 of [38], to map each point function to a higher dimensional point in $\mathbf{GF}(q^{mR_k})^T$, such that the mapping is linear then we utilize the DMUSS scheme, to generate the functional shares, then by using the linearity of the mapping and the inverse Vandermonde matrices, we prove the correctness of our scheme. The privacy of the scheme also is guaranteed by the privacy condition of DMUSS. Our metric to understand the quality of the scheme is the point function rate of each user defined as $r_k \triangleq \frac{H(X_k,Z_k)}{M}$ which signifies the storage efficiency. We say that a rate tuple $(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k)$ is achievable if there exists a DMUPF scheme satisfying privacy and correctness conditions and the capacity region is defined as the closure of the set of all achievable rate tuples. Our contribution is summarized in Theorem 1, whereby our achievable scheme we find the inner part of the capacity region and by our novel converse we characterize an outer bound for the capacity region. The converse relies on the extension of [1]. We believe that this work opens up new directions for future investigation, such as the characterization of the exact capacity region and also investigating the problem under perfect privacy conditions, extending the result to the comparison functions, multi-point functions and finally path subfunctions. Also designing a verifiable information-theoretic point function would be an interesting direction for further investigations.

Paper Organization: In Section II some elementary concepts are defined. We present the system model of the problem in Section III, In Section IV, Theorem 1 is presented. we elaborate on the achievable scheme in Section V, and in Section VI, the converse argument is presented and in Section VII, we discuss the results and conclude.

Notations: For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $[n]$ as the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $n_1 \leq n_2$, define $[n_1 : n_2]$ as the set $\{n_1, n_1+1, \dots, n_2\}$. For a set $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\}$, $A_{\mathcal{I}}$ represents $\{A_{i_1}, A_{i_2}, \dots, A_{i_n}\}$. For two sets $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$, $\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_2$ is the set of elements in $\mathcal{A}_1$ but not in $\mathcal{A}_2$. For matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}]$ indicates the concatenation of the two matrices. $o(M)$ represents a function that approaches zero as $M \to \infty$. $\mathbf{I}_K$ represents the $K \times K$ identity matrix. If $\mathbf{C}$ is a matrix and $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ denotes the sub-matrix formed by rows indexed by $\mathcal{I}$ and columns indexed by $\mathcal{J}$. The finite field $\mathbf{GF}(q^m)$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, is denoted as $\mathbb{F}$. For a vector $\mathbf{w} = [w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{R-1}]^\intercal \in \mathbb{F}^{R\times 1}$, $R \in \mathbb{N}$. $\mathbf{w}(n_1 : n_2)$, where $n_1 \leq n_2$, represents $[w_{n_1}, w_{n_1+1}, \dots, w_{n_2}]$. Finally, $\mathbb{F}_R = \mathbf{GF}(q^{mR})$, where $R \in \mathbb{R}, mR \in \mathbb{N}$ and q is a prime number. Also note that $\mathbb{F}_R^* = \mathbb{F}_R \backslash \{0\}$.

II. Preliminaries

In this section, we present the definitions of Distributed Multi-User Secret Sharing (DMUSS), Point Function, and Distributed Point Function (DPF) protocols.

Definition 1. Distributed Multi-User Secret Sharing (DMUSS): DMUSS is introduced in [2], involves a master node containing K secret messages $W_k, k \in [K]$, each of rate $R'_k = \frac{|W_k|}{M}$. The master node connects to N storage nodes via error-free links, where each storage node has a capacity of M q-ary. Each user $k \in [K]$ is connected to a subset of storage nodes, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_k$, referred to as the access set.

An achievable DMUSS scheme, as presented in [1], enables the master node to deliver W_k (with maximal size) to user k while ensuring the privacy condition that is, no user can obtain any information about the secret messages of other users [1]. The placement phase of the DMUSS scheme includes two steps:

1. **Global Parameter Evaluation**: The master node computes global parameters using the **Param** function, defined as:

$$\textbf{Param}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_K) \triangleq (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_K), \quad (1)$$

where the definitions and roles of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$, $k \in [K]$, are detailed in [1] for an operating field $\mathbb{F}$.

2. **Encoded Data Evaluation**: The encoded data is generated using the DMUSS encoding function:

$$\begin{aligned}&\textbf{Enc}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, W_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_K, W_K)\\ &\triangleq (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N) = \mathbf{y},\ \forall W_k \in \mathbf{F}_{R_k}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the encoded shares, each of size M in a q-ary format, are computed using the global parameters and the secrets. The scheme is information-theoretically private, meaning that for any $k \neq \tilde{k},\ k, \tilde{k} \in [K]$:

$$H(W_k) = H(W_k \mid Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}). \tag{3}$$

In the retrieval phase, user k employs the decoding function, using $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$, and $Y_{\mathcal{A}_k}$. Specifically:

$$\hat{W}_k \triangleq \mathbf{Dec}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k, Y_{\mathcal{A}_k}),\ k \in [K], \tag{4}$$

ensuring correctness as specified in [1].

Definition 2. Point Function: Let $[T]$ denote the domain and $\mathbb{F}$ the range. For any $V \in [T]$ and $Z \in \mathbb{F}^*$, a point function $f_{X,Z} : [T] \to \mathbb{F}^*$ is defined as:

$$f_{X,Z}(V) = \begin{cases} Z & \text{if } V = X, \\ 0 & \text{if } V \neq X. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

III. System Model

The Distributed Multi-User Point Function (DMUPF) problem consists of a master node, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ server nodes, each with storage of size $M \in \mathbb{N}$, and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ users. Each user $k \in [K]$ has its own associated point function $f_{X_k,Z_k} : [T] \to \mathbb{F}_{R_k} \backslash 0$, where $R_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$.

From the definition of a point function, there exists a one-to-one map between the pair $(X_k, Z_k) \in [T] \times \mathbb{F}^*_{R_k}$ and f_{X_k,Z_k}. We assume that each point function is full-entropy:

$$H(f_{X_k,Z_k}) \triangleq H(X_k, Z_k) \tag{6}$$

$$= \log(T) + \log(q^{mR_k} - 1), \tag{7}$$

and define the rate of each user as: $r_k \triangleq \frac{H(f_{X_k,Z_k})}{M}$. The master node knows f_{X_k,Z_k} for all $k \in [K]$ and is connected to all server nodes. Each user $k \in [K]$ connects to a subset of server nodes, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_k \subseteq [N]$, via error-free and secure links, as shown in Fig. 1. The goal is for each user to retrieve $U_k \triangleq f_{X_k,Z_k}(V_k)$ correctly and privately.

The DMUPF scheme consists of four phases: placement, demand, evaluation, and retrieval.

a) Placement Phase: In the placement phase, the master node, knowing all functions f_{X_k,Z_k} and access sets $\mathcal{A}_k$ for all $k \in [K]$, generates functional shares $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_N \in \mathbb{F}_M$ and distributes them to the corresponding server nodes:

$$(G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_N) = \phi^M(f_{X_1,Z_1}, f_{X_2,Z_2}, \ldots, f_{X_K,Z_K}),$$

where:

$$\phi^M : \prod_{i=1}^{K} [T] \times \mathbb{F}^*_{R_i} \to \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{F}_M.$$

Each functional share is stored in its respective server.



Fig. 1. The Distributed Multi-User Point Function (DMUPF) system: A master node containing K point functions $f_{X_k,Z_k} : [T] \to \mathbb{F}^*_{R_k}$, $k \in [K]$, connects via error-free links to N server nodes, each with storage capacity M. User $k \in [K]$ is connected to the server nodes in $\mathcal{A}_k$. The goal is to design placement, demand, evaluation, and retrieval phases that satisfy correctness and privacy conditions.

b) Demand Phase: In the demand phase, each user $k \in [K]$ transmits its desired point $V_k \in [T]$ to the servers it can access, $\mathcal{A}_k$. This communication is assumed to be secure and error-free.

c) Evaluation Phase: Each server $n \in [N]$, upon receiving G_n and the demand points from connected users, computes functional shares $C_{k,n}$ for the point function evaluations and sends them to the corresponding users:

$$C_{k,n} = \Psi_n(G_n, V_k), \quad n \in [N],$$

where:

$$\Psi_n : \mathbb{F}_M \times [T] \to \mathbb{F}.$$

d) Retrieval Phase: In the retrieval phase, each user $k \in [K]$ combines responses from servers in $\mathcal{A}_k$ using a decoding function θ_k:

$$\hat{U}_k = \theta_k(C_{\mathcal{A}_k}),$$

where:

$$\theta_k : \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|} \mathbb{F} \to \mathbb{F}_{R_k}.$$

This decoding function uses linear summation to reconstruct U_k efficiently.

The DMUPF scheme must satisfy the following conditions:

Correctness Condition: The correctness condition ensures that user $k \in [K]$ retrieves U_k without error as $M \to \infty$. Formally:

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_e = 0, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_e = \mathbb{P}(U_k \neq \hat{U}_k)$.

Privacy Condition: The privacy condition guarantees that user k learns nothing about the point function of any other user $\tilde{k} \neq k$, even when observing its access set:

$$H(f_{X_k,Z_k}) = H(f_{X_k,Z_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}). \tag{9}$$

Achievable Rates and Capacity Region: A rate tuple $(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_K)$ is said to be achievable if there exists a DMUPF scheme satisfying the correctness and privacy conditions. The capacity region $\mathcal{C}$ of the DMUPF system is defined as the closure of all achievable rate tuples in $\mathbb{R}^K$. Our goal is to characterize this capacity region for any given access set $\mathcal{A}_k$, $k \in [K]$.

IV. Main Results

Theorem 1. *The boundary of the capacity region of DMUPF under weak privacy conditions lies on the rate region specified by $(r_1, \ldots, r_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ satisfying:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{k \neq \tilde{k}} |\mathcal{A}_k \backslash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|/T - o(\frac{1}{Tm}) \\ &\leq r_k \leq \min_{k \neq \tilde{k}} |\mathcal{A}_k \backslash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|, \ \ \forall k, \tilde{k} \in [K], \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &|\cup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{A}_i|/T - o(\frac{1}{Tm}) \quad \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} r_i \\ &\leq |\cup_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{A}_i|, \quad \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq [K]. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we recall from the notations that the main operating field is $\mathbb{F} = \mathbf{GF}(q^m)$.

The achievability and converse proofs are provided in Section V and Section VI, respectively.

V. Proof of Theorem 1: Achievability

In this section, we formally present the DMUPF achievable scheme. Before describing the formal step-by-step achievable scheme, we state Lemma 1 and define mapping functions that are necessary to transform the point functions into elements of a larger ambient space, enabling it to be treated as a DMUSS problem.

The scheme begins with the *initialization phase*, during which the parameters of the scheme are set. Following this, we describe the *placement phase*, which involves the generation of functional secret shares using Lemma 1 and the DMUSS encoding function. Subsequently, the *demand phase* and *evaluation phase* are detailed. In the evaluation phase, we describe the computations each server must perform and the parameters that must be sent to the connected users using the functional secret shares. Finally, the scheme concludes with the *retrieval phase*, where we explain how users decode their desired outputs.

In Subsections V-A5a and V-A5b, we prove the correctness and privacy of the proposed scheme, respectively. While the scheme assumes $R_k \in \mathbb{N}, : k \in [K]$, it can be extended to $R_k \in \mathbb{R}, : k \in [K]$ through a memory-sharing argument similar to the one used in [1]. We state the following lemma, which forms the foundation for our achievable scheme.

Lemma 1. Let $E(X, Z, k) : [T] \times \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^* \times [K] \to \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^H$, $R \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in [K]$, be defined as follows. First, choose an arbitrary set $\mathcal{B}$ of T vectors in $\mathbb{F}_{R_k}^H$ that have exactly d ones and $H - d$ zeros[2]. Let $\tau : [T] \to \mathcal{B}$ be a fixed bijection. Then $E(X, Z, k)$ is obtained by replacing one of the ones in $\tau(X)$ (e.g., the one with the largest index) with Z.

For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^H$, define:

$$F_{\mathbf{x},k}(z_1, \ldots, z_H) \triangleq \sum_{i \in [H]} x_i \prod_{\ell=1}^{H} z_\ell^{\mathbf{E}(i,1,k)_\ell},$$

where $\mathbf{E}(i, 1, k)_\ell$ is the ℓ-th coordinate of $\mathbf{E}(i, 1, k)$. Then, $F_{\mathbf{x},k}$ has total degree d, and for every $X \in [T]$ and $Z \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}$:

$$F_{\mathbf{x},k}(E(X, Z, k)) = Z\mathbf{x}_X. \tag{12}$$

Remark 1. When $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_{X'} \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^H$, we have:

$$F_{\mathbf{e}_{X'},k}(z_1, \ldots, z_H) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{H} z_\ell^{\mathbf{E}(X',1,k)_\ell},$$

which satisfies:

$$F_{\mathbf{e}_{X'},k}(E(X, Z, k)) = \begin{cases} Z & \text{if } X = X', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 1 follows directly from the proof of Lemma 5 in [38]. □

A. The Achievable Scheme

Now we describe the achievable scheme in detail as follows:

1) Initialization: We assume that $R_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in [K]$, and $d = 1$. By Lemma 1, $M = H$. Let us define:

$$\mathbf{w}_k \triangleq [W_{k,1}\ W_{k,2}\ \ldots\ W_{k,T}]^\intercal = \mathbf{E}(X_k, Z_k, k) \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^T, \tag{13}$$

where $W_{k,i_k} \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}$, $k \in [K]$, $i_k \in [R_k]$ is the i_k-th element of $W_k \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}$.

Additionally, the master node computes:

$$(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_K) = \mathbf{Param}(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_K),$$

[2]This is possible since $\binom{H}{d} \geq T$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k, \forall k \in [K]$ are defined as in (20) and (21) of [1] and are globally available to all participating parties. These parameters are functions of the access sets and remain fixed throughout the scheme.

2) Placement Phase: In the placement phase, the master node, having $\mathbf{w}_k$, $k \in [K]$, executes the DMUSS placement procedure for all $k \in [K]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{g}_t^{\intercal} &\triangleq [G_{1,t}, G_{2,t}, \ldots, G_{N,t}] \quad t \in [T] \\ &= \mathbf{Enc}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, W_{1,t}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_K, W_{K,t}), \\ G_n &= [G_{n,1}, G_{n,2}, \ldots, G_{n,T}] \in \mathbb{F}_M^T, \ n \in [N]. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The master node then sends G_n to server node $n \in [N]$. Note that since $G_n \in \mathbb{F}_M^T$, the memory size M must satisfy $M \geq Tm$, ensuring each server has sufficient storage.

3) Demand Phase: In the demand phase, user k transmits its desired point $V_k \in [T]$ to the servers in its access set $\mathcal{A}_k$.

4) Evaluation Phase: For a fixed user k, any connected server $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$ computes functional shares as follows:

$$C_{k,n}^{(0)} = -\alpha_{k,n} \mathbf{I}_1^k(1,j) F_{\mathbf{e}_{V_k}}(G_n),$$

where $\alpha_{k,n}$ is defined in (V-A1) and made public by the master node. The matrix $\mathbf{I}_j^k$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{I}_j^k \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \gamma_{k,1}^1 & \gamma_{k,1}^2 & \cdots & \gamma_{k,1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-j} \\ 1 & \gamma_{k,2}^1 & \gamma_{k,2}^2 & \cdots & \gamma_{k,2}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \gamma_{k,|\mathcal{A}_k|-j}^1 & \gamma_{k,|\mathcal{A}_k|-j}^2 & \cdots & \gamma_{k,|\mathcal{A}_k|-j}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-j} \end{bmatrix}^{-1},$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{V_k} \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}^T$ is an indicator vector with a one in the V_k-th position and zeros elsewhere.

Subsequent computations for $j \in \{1, \ldots, R_k - 1\}$ are performed iteratively, updating $C_{k,n}^{(j)}$. Finally:

$$C_{k,n} = (C_{k,n}^{(1)}, C_{k,n}^{(2)}, \ldots, C_{k,n}^{(R_k)}) \in \mathbb{F}_{R_k}.$$

5) Retrieval Phase: User $k \in [K]$ retrieves its desired function output $f_{X_k,Z_k}(V_k)$ by computing:

$$\hat{U}_k = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|} C_{k,n_i}^{(0)}, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-(R_k-1)} C_{k,n_i}^{(R_k-1)} \right) \tag{15}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_k = \{n_{k,1}, n_{k,2}, \ldots, n_{k,|\mathcal{A}_k|}\}$ are the servers connected to user k.

a) Proof of Correctness: To prove that the scheme is correct, we need to show that (8) holds, ensuring $U_k = \hat{U}_k$. From the evaluation phase, we know:

$$F_{\mathbf{e}_{V_k}}(G_n) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{T} G_{n,t}^{\mathbf{E}(V_k,1,k)_\ell} = G_{n,V_k}, \tag{16}$$

since $\mathbf{E}(V_k, 1, k)_\ell = 0, \ \forall \ell \in [T] \setminus \{V_k\}$, and $\mathbf{E}(V_k, 1, k)_{V_k} = 1$.

From the DMUSS scheme, we also know that for any $t \in [T]$ and $k \in [K]$, the following system of equations holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &-\alpha_{k,n} G_{n,t} = W_{k,t,0} + W_{k,t,1} \gamma_{k,A(n,k)}^1 + \cdots \\ &+ W_{k,t,R_k-1} \gamma_{k,A(n,k)}^{R_k-1} \quad + P_{k,R_k} \gamma_{k,A(n,k)}^{R_k} + \cdots \\ &+ P_{k,|\mathcal{A}_k|} \gamma_{k,A(n,k)}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-1}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{A}_k, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

which implies:

$$W_{k,t,0} = -\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|} \alpha_{k,n} \mathbf{I}_1^k(1,i) G_{n_i}.$$

Subtracting $W_{k,t,0}$ from both sides of (17) and multiplying by $\gamma_{k,A(n,k)}^{-1}$, we obtain:

$$W_{k,t,1} = -\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_k|-1} \alpha_{k,n} \mathbf{I}_2^k(1,i) G_{n_i}.$$

Repeating this process for $W_{k,t,j}$, $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, R_k - 1\}$, and substituting back, we verify:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_k &= (W_{k,V_k,0}, W_{k,V_k,1}, \ldots, W_{k,V_k,R_k-1}) \\ &= W_{k,V_k} \\ &= F_{\mathbf{e}_{V_k}}(E(V_k, Z_k, k)) \\ &= Z_k \cdot (\mathbf{e}_{V_k})_{V_k} \\ &= U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the scheme satisfies the correctness condition.

b) Proof of Privacy: To prove privacy, we need to show that (9) holds, ensuring that $H(f_{X_k,Z_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) = H(f_{X_k,Z_k})$ for all $k \neq \tilde{k}$.

The G_n, $n \in [N]$, are mutually independent due to Lemma 3 in [1]. For all $k \in [K]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H(f_{X_k,Z_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) &\overset{(a)}{=} H(X_k, Z_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} H(\mathbf{w}_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &\overset{(c)}{\geq} H(G_{\mathcal{A}_k^{(-\tilde{k})}}) \\ &\overset{(d)}{=} \log(T) + \log(q^{R_k} - 1) \\ &\overset{(e)}{=} H(f_{X_k,Z_k}), \end{aligned}$$

where: (a) follows because (X_k, Z_k) is a deterministic function of f_{X_k,Z_k}, (b) follows from (13) and the bijection property of $E(\cdot)$, (c) follows from the privacy proof of DMUSS in [1], (d) follows because $|A_k^{(-\tilde{k})}| = R_k$, and $G_{\mathcal{A}_k^{(-\tilde{k})}}$ uniquely determines $\mathbf{w}_k$, (e) follows from (7).

Thus, the privacy condition is satisfied.

c) Conclusion of the Proof: For the scheme to satisfy both correctness and privacy, the following conditions must hold:

$$R_k \leq |\mathcal{A}_k \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|, \quad \forall k, \tilde{k} \in [K], \tag{18}$$

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{S}} R_k \leq |\cup_{k\in\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{A}_k|, \quad \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq [K]. \tag{19}$$

In terms of the point function rate, we have:

$$r_k \leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}_k \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|}{T} - o\left(\frac{1}{Tm}\right), \quad \forall k, \tilde{k} \in [K],$$

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{S}} r_k \leq \frac{|\cup_{k\in\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{A}_k|}{T} - o\left(\frac{1}{Tm}\right), \quad \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq [K].$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

VI. Proof of Theorem 1: Converse

Consider two users, k and $\tilde{k}$. The master node intends to privately transmit $f_{X_k,Z_k}(V_k) = U_k$, where U_k has a size of R_k q-ary, to user k. The other user, $\tilde{k}$, acts as an eavesdropper and aims to obtain information about f_{X_k,Z_k}.

From the correctness and privacy conditions in (8) and (9), respectively, we have:

$$H(f_{X_k,Z_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}, G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) = Mo(M), \tag{20}$$

$$H(f_{X_k,Z_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) = H(f_{X_k,Z_k}). \tag{21}$$

Let $W_k = (X_k, Y_k)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} &I(G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}; W_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &= H(G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &- H(G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}} \mid W_k, G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) && (22)\\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} H(G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) && (23)\\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} M|\mathcal{A}_k \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|, && (24)\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that conditioning does not increase entropy, and (b) follows because the maximum entropy occurs when the data in $G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}$ are independent and uniformly distributed.

Next, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &I(G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}; W_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &= H(W_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) \\ &- H(W_k \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_k\cap\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}, G_{\mathcal{A}_k\setminus\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}}) && (25)\\ &\overset{(a)}{=} H(W_k) - Mo(M), && (26)\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (20) and (21).

Combining (24) and (26), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &H(W_k) - Mo(M) \\ &= \log(T) + \log(|\mathbb{F}|^{R_k} - 1) - Mo(M) \\ &\leq M|\mathcal{A}_k \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|. && (27)\end{aligned}$$

As $M \to \infty$, this implies:

$$\begin{aligned} r_k &= \lim_{M\to\infty} \frac{\log(T) + \log(|\mathbb{F}|^{R_k} - 1)}{M} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{A}_k \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{k}}|. && (28)\end{aligned}$$

This completes the converse proof for (10). Now we prove (11). Consider any arbitrary set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [K]$, where $\mathcal{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\}$. From the problem setup and the correctness condition in (8), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &H(W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}}) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{S}|Mo(M), && (29)\\ &H(W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k}) = M\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} r_j. && (30)\end{aligned}$$

Next:

$$\begin{aligned} &I(G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}}; W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k}) && (31)\\ &= H(G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}}) && (32)\\ &- H(G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}} \mid W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k}) && (33)\\ &\leq M|\mathcal{A}_{j_1} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{A}_{j_k}|. && (34)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned} &I(G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}}; W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k}) \\ &= H(W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k}) \\ &- H(W_{j_1}, \ldots, W_{j_k} \mid G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_1}}, \ldots, G_{\mathcal{A}_{j_k}}) && (35)\\ &\overset{(a)}{\geq} M\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} r_j - |\mathcal{S}|Mo(M), && (36)\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (29) and (30).

Combining (34) and (36), we get:

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} r_j \leq |\mathcal{A}_{j_1} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{A}_{j_k}| + |\mathcal{S}|o(M).$$

As $o(M) \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$, this completes the proof.

VII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced the problem of DMUPF, which synthesizes the principles of multi-user secret sharing and information-theoretic distributed point functions (DPFs) into a unified protocol. Our proposed DMUPF scheme operates in four distinct phases: placement, demand, evaluation, and retrieval. We have demonstrated how the scheme allows each user to retrieve their desired point function value while ensuring that no statistical information about other users' functions is leaked, thereby meeting the correctness and privacy conditions.

We investigated the DMUPF scheme under the weak secrecy condition, ensuring that each user does not obtain any information about other users' point functions. While this work addresses the weak secrecy condition, designing schemes that preserve the perfect privacy condition remains an open problem for further investigation.

To achieve our results, we utilized novel mapping functions, as introduced in Lemma 5 of [38], to map each point function into a higher-dimensional space while maintaining linearity. This allowed us to leverage DMUSS schemes and inverse Vandermonde matrices to generate functional shares and prove the correctness of our protocol. Privacy is inherently guaranteed through the privacy conditions of DMUSS.

The primary metric for evaluating the efficiency of our scheme is the point function rate, defined as $r_k \triangleq \frac{H(X_k,Z_k)}{M}$, which measures storage efficiency. We provided an inner bound for the achievable rate region through our constructive scheme and characterized an outer bound via a novel converse inspired by [1]. These results offer significant insights into the capacity region of DMUPF.

This work opens several avenues for future research. Key directions include the exact characterization of the capacity region, extending the problem to perfect privacy conditions, and exploring the implementation of comparison functions, multi-point functions, and path subfunctions. Additionally, designing verifiable information-theoretic point functions presents an exciting challenge for further exploration. We believe that this framework establishes a foundational basis for advancing the field of secure distributed computation and secret sharing.

References

[1] A. Khalesi, M. Mirmohseni, and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "The capacity region of distributed multi-user secret sharing," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1057–1071, 2021.

[2] M. Soleymani and H. Mahdavifar, "Distributed multi-user secret sharing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 164–178, 2020.

[3] A. Masoud Jafarpisheh, M. Mirmohseni, and M. Ali Maddah-Ali, "Distributed attribute-based private access control," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2856–2861, 2022.

[4] Y. Lu and S. A. Jafar, "On single server private information retrieval with private coded side information," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 3263–3284, 2023.

[5] H. Sun and S. A. Jafar, "The capacity of private computation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 3880–3897, 2018.

[6] 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)*, pp. 103–108, 2022.

[7] Z. Chen, Z. Wang, and S. A. Jafar, "The asymptotic capacity of private search," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 4709–4721, 2020.

[8] H. Sun and S. A. Jafar, "The capacity of private computation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 3880–3897, 2019.

[9] S. Vithana and S. Ulukus, "Information-theoretically private federated submodel learning with storage constrained databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 8, pp. 6041–6059, 2024.

[10] Z. Wang and S. Ulukus, "Communication cost of two-database symmetric private information retrieval: A conditional disclosure of multiple secrets perspective," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 402–407, 2022.

[11] M. H. Mousavi, M. Ali Maddah-Ali, and M. Mirmohseni, "Private inner product retrieval for distributed machine learning," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 355–359, 2019.

[12] M. Mirmohseni and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "Private function retrieval," in *2018 Iran Workshop on Communication and Information Theory (IWCIT)*, pp. 1–6, 2018.

[13] H. Akbari-Nodehi and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "Secure coded multi-party computation for massive matrix operations," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 2379–2398, 2021.

[14] B. Tahmasebi and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "Private function computation," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1118–1123, 2020.

[15] B. Buyukates, J. So, H. Mahdavifar, and S. Avestimehr, "Lightverifl: A lightweight and verifiable secure aggregation for federated learning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 5, pp. 285–301, 2024.

[16] S. Vithana and S. Ulukus, "Efficient private federated submodel learning," in *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pp. 3394–3399, 2022.

[17] N. Kazempour, M. Mirmohseni, and M. R. Aref, "Private authentication: Optimal information theoretic schemes," in *2019 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pp. 1–5, 2019.

[18] T. Tang, R. E. Ali, H. Hashemi, T. Gangwani, S. Avestimehr, and M. Annavaram, "Adaptive verifiable coded computing: Towards fast, secure and private distributed machine learning," in *2022 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pp. 628–638, 2022.

[19] J. So, B. Güler, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Codedprivateml: A fast and privacy-preserving framework for distributed machine learning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 441–451, 2021.

[20] Q. Yu and A. S. Avestimehr, "Entangled polynomial codes for secure, private, and batch distributed matrix multiplication:

Breaking the "cubic" barrier," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 245–250, 2020.

[21] R. Cartor, R. G. L. D'Oliveira, S. E. Rouayheb, D. Heinlein, D. Karpuk, and A. Sprintson, "Secure distributed matrix multiplication with precomputation," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2568–2573, 2024.

[22] M. Soleymani, H. Mahdavifar, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Analog secret sharing with applications to private distributed learning," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 1893–1904, 2022.

[23] M. Soleymani, H. Mahdavifar, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Analog privacy-preserving coded computing," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1865–1870, 2021.

[24] S. Ulukus, S. Avestimehr, M. Gastpar, S. A. Jafar, R. Tandon, and C. Tian, "Private retrieval, computing, and learning: Recent progress and future challenges," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 729–748, 2022.

[25] A. Shamir, "How to share a secret," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 612–613, 1979.

[26] G. R. Blakley, "Safeguarding cryptographic keys," in *1979 International Workshop on Managing Requirements Knowledge (MARK)*, pp. 313–318, IEEE, 1979.

[27] M. Ito, A. Saito, and T. Nishizeki, "Secret sharing scheme realizing general access structure," *Electronics and Communications in Japan (Part III: Fundamental Electronic Science)*, vol. 72, no. 9, pp. 56–64, 1989.

[28] G. R. Blakley Jr and G. A. Kabatiansky, "Generalized ideal secret-sharing schemes and matroids," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 102–110, 1997.

[29] A. K. Chattopadhyay, S. Saha, A. Nag, and S. Nandi, "Secret sharing: A comprehensive survey, taxonomy and applications," *Computer Science Review*, vol. 51, p. 100608, 2024.

[30] E. Boyle, N. Gilboa, and Y. Ishai, "Function secret sharing," in *Annual international conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*, pp. 337–367, Springer, 2015.

[31] S. Li, S. Avestimehr, *et al.*, "Coded computing: Mitigating fundamental bottlenecks in large-scale distributed computing and machine learning," *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–148, 2020.

[32] E. Boyle, N. Gilboa, Y. Ishai, and V. I. Kolobov, "Information-Theoretic Distributed Point Functions," in *3rd Conference on Information-Theoretic Cryptography (ITC 2022)* (D. Dachman-Soled, ed.), vol. 230 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, (Dagstuhl, Germany), pp. 17:1–17:14, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.

[33] B. Chor, E. Kushilevitz, O. Goldreich, and M. Sudan, "Private information retrieval," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 965–981, 1998.

[34] J. Doerner and A. Shelat, "Scaling oram for secure computation," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 523–535, 2017.

[35] J. Luo, L. F. Zhang, F. Lin, and C. Lin, "Efficient threshold function secret sharing with information-theoretic security," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 6523–6532, 2020.

[36] W. M. Li and L. F. Zhang, "Towards efficient information-theoretic function secret sharing," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 28512–28523, 2020.

[37] J. Li, P. Ke, and L. F. Zhang, "Efficient information-theoretic distributed point function with general output groups," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023.

[38] S. Kruglik, S. H. Dau, H. M. Kiah, H. Wang, and L. F. Zhang, "Verifiable information-theoretic function secret sharing," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2024.

[39] W.-A. Jackson, K. M. Martin, and C. M. O'Keefe, "On sharing many secrets," in *International Conference on the theory and application of cryptology*, pp. 42–54, Springer, 1994.

[40] J. Wu, N. Liu, and W. Kang, "The capacity region of distributed multi-user secret sharing under perfect secrecy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 9954–9969, 2024.

[41] J. Wu, N. Liu, and W. Kang, "The capacity region of distributed multi-user secret sharing under perfect secrecy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 9954–9969, 2024.

[42] R. De Prisco, A. De Santis, and F. Palmieri, "Bounds and protocols for graph-based distributed secret sharing," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 434–448, 2024.

[43] R. De Prisco, A. De Santis, and F. Palmieri, "Improved protocols for distributed secret sharing," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 3558–3571, 2023.

[44] J. Wu, N. Liu, and W. Kang, "Multiple threshold schemes under the weak secure condition," *arXiv preprint*, vol. 2312.05737, 2023.

[45] R. A. Chou, "Distributed secret sharing over a public channel from correlated random variables," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 2851–2869, 2024.

[46] R. Chigullapally, H. Athi, V. Lalitha, and N. Karamchandani, "On distributed multi-user secret sharing with multiple secrets per user," in *2024 National Conference on Communications (NCC)*, pp. 1–6, 2024.

[47] P. D'Arco, R. D. Prisco, and A. D. Santis, "Constructions and lower bounds for evolving 2-threshold secret sharing schemes," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2024.

[48] T. Guo, X. Guang, and K. W. Shum, "On the rate region of symmetric multilevel imperfect secret sharing," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 470–485, 2021.