

Zero-Knowledge Mechanisms*

Ran Canetti[†] Amos Fiat[‡] Yannai A. Gonczarowski[§]

July 4, 2025

Abstract

A powerful feature in mechanism design is the ability to irrevocably commit to the rules of a mechanism. Commitment is achieved by public declaration, which enables players to verify incentive properties in advance and the outcome in retrospect. However, public declaration can reveal superfluous information that the mechanism designer might prefer not to disclose, such as her target function or private costs. Avoiding this may be possible via a trusted mediator; however, the availability of a trust *worthy* mediator, especially if mechanism secrecy must be maintained for years, might be unrealistic. We propose a new approach to commitment, and show how to commit to, and run, *any given mechanism* without disclosing it, while enabling the verification of incentive properties and the outcome—all without the need for any mediators. Our framework utilizes zero-knowledge proofs—a cornerstone of modern cryptographic theory. Applications include both private-type settings such as auctions and private-action settings such as contracts, as well as non-mediated bargaining with hidden yet binding offers.


*The authors thank Alex Teytelboym, Nina Bobkova, Eric Budish, Ben Brooks, Modibo Camara, Laura Doval, Piotr Dworczak, George Georgiadis, Shafi Goldwasser, Sergiu Hart, Andreas Haupt, Ángel Hernando-Veciana, Zoë Hitzig, Emir Kamenica, Jacob Leshno, Shengwu Li, Eric Maskin, Steven Matthews, Stephen Morris, Roger Myerson, Noam Nisan, Mallesh Pai, David Parkes, Phil Reny, József Sákovics, Ron Siegel, Tomasz Strzalecki, Alex Teytelboym, Clayton Thomas, Rakesh Vohra, Doron Ravid, Assaf Romm, Joe Root, and participants at the 2022 Cowles Conference on Economic Theory, 7th Lindau Meeting on Economic Sciences, INFORMS 2022, ASSA-NAWM 2023, the WZB Workshop on Strategy-Proofness and Beyond, INFORMS Workshop on Market Design 2024, and at seminars at The Hebrew University, Harvard, MIT, Penn State, VSET, NYU, UChicago, UPenn, A16z Crypto, UCL, LSE, and Oxford, for helpful comments and discussions. The authors gratefully acknowledge research support by the following sources. Canetti: Supported by DARPA under Agreement No. HR00112020021; any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Government or DARPA. Gonczarowski: National Science Foundation (NSF-BSF grant No. 2343922) and Harvard FAS Dean’s Competitive Fund for Promising Scholarship. Parts of the work of Gonczarowski were carried out while at Tel Aviv University and at Microsoft Research.

[†]Department of Computer Science, Boston University — *E-mail*: canetti@bu.edu.

[‡]Department of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University — *E-mail*: fiat@tau.ac.il.

[§]Department of Economics and Department of Computer Science, Harvard University — *E-mail*: yannai@gonch.name.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Contributions	11
2	Illustrative Examples	12
2.1	Illustrative Example 1: Commitment to Hidden Mechanism & Zero-Knowledge Proof of Properly Running It	12
2.2	Illustrative Example 2: Never Fully Reveal	16
2.3	Illustrative Example 3: Zero-Knowledge Proof of Incentive Compatibility	17
2.4	Illustrative Example 4: Zero-Knowledge Proof of Properly Running a Randomized Mechanism	20
3	Preliminaries	23
3.1	Standard Definitions	23
3.2	Languages for Mechanisms and Proofs	24
3.3	The Traditional Protocol	26
3.4	A Mechanism-Hiding Mediated Protocol	27
4	Mechanism Hiding via Zero-Knowledge Proofs	28
4.1	Trusted Commitment to Hidden Mechanism: Overview	29
4.2	Formal Definition: Commit-and-Run Protocols	31
4.3	Theoretical Guarantees and Main Result	38
5	Extensions	47
5.1	Private Actions and Moral Hazard: Zero-Knowledge Contracts	47
5.2	Individually Revealing Parts of the Outcome: To Each Their Own	48
5.3	Hiding Both the Mechanism and the Types	49
5.4	Beyond Mechanism Design	52
6	Discussion	53
	References	56
A	Formal Proofs and Tools for the Illustrative Examples from Section 2	A.1
B	Strong Hiding: A Simulation-Based Approach	A.8
C	Commit-then-Prove Protocols	A.13
D	Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 via Commit-then-Prove Protocols	A.18
E	Illustrative Example 5: Simple Secure Multiparty Computation of Single-Item Pricing	A.25
 F	Proofs for Appendix C	A.26
	References for Appendices	A.28

1 Introduction

At the heart of the mechanism-design paradigm lies the designer’s ability to commit to a mechanism. Public declaration of the mechanism does not only facilitate the commitment, but also serves to allow the players to inspect the mechanism and verify its strategic properties or other properties of interest. For example, the fact that a player will recognize a dominant strategy as such enables the mechanism designer to predict play when designing the mechanism.

However, the mechanism being an “open book” reveals far more than incentive properties. By inspecting the mechanism, players might be able to infer information that the mechanism designer may have preferred to conceal, when such information influences the design of the mechanism. For example, consider a setting with one seller with one good for sale, and one buyer. Imagine that the seller posts the optimal monopoly price for the good—a price calculated based on both the seller’s prior over the buyer’s valuation and the seller’s cost. Then, a buyer who knows the seller’s prior could reverse the calculation and infer the seller’s cost (under generic conditions). And, this cost might be a trade secret.¹ In more complex auction or selling settings, one could think not only of costs as being trade secrets, but also of inventory size, production capabilities, and even qualitative features such as whether the mechanism was constructed to maximize welfare or revenue.

One way to commit to a mechanism without disclosing any information except for its incentive properties is via a trusted mediator. In the monopoly-price example, the seller could discreetly entrust such a mediator with the price. The buyer would then declare her value (maximum willingness to pay), and the mediator would reveal the price if it is lower than the buyer’s value, and otherwise only say that the price is higher than the value. With more general mechanisms, the mechanism designer could discreetly entrust the mediator with the mechanism description, while the mediator could verify and guarantee its incentive properties (e.g., individual rationality and incentive compatibility) to the players. After all bids or actions have been declared, the mediator could certify that the outcome declared by the designer indeed corresponds to the mechanism entrusted to her in the outset. The mediator would then never speak of this mechanism again.²

The availability of a *trustworthy* mediator, however, is a strong, often unrealistic, as-

¹Why the seller might wish to keep her cost, or any other information, secret is unmodeled for now (and surely breaks away from a standard monopolist setting, so this example is in no way a criticism of the literature on revenue maximization).

²Indeed, some trade secrets might be harmful if disclosed even years later.

sumption. Indeed, when the famous German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe trusted his personal lawyer to serve as a mediator and keep secret the reserve price in a BDM-style offer (Becker, DeGroot, and Marschak, 1964) that Goethe made to his publisher to elicit the publisher’s valuation of Goethe’s new poem, Goethe’s own trusted personal lawyer turned out to not be *trustworthy*: he leaked the price to the publisher, who could then bid precisely that price and no more. In their paper that recounts and analyzes this fascinating story, Moldovanu and Tietzel (1998) note:

“Commitments based on a secret reserve price are, in general, hard to achieve: if it is secret, what is to stop the seller from reneging? Part of Goethe’s cleverness consisted in devising the scheme such that commitment is achieved by using a third, neutral party.”

In this paper, we investigate to what extent secrecy guarantees such as those provided through a reliable mediator can be given absent a mediator, or in other words, to what extent public disclosure is an inseparable part of commitment to a mechanism when a mediator is not available.

The traditional *protocol* that is used to commit (by public declaration) to an IR (individually rational) and IC (incentive compatible) direct-revelation mechanism and then run it can be formalized as consisting of three messages:

1. *Commitment*: The mechanism designer (e.g., seller) sends a message to the player (e.g., buyer),³ describing the mechanism. By virtue of this message, (a) commitment is established (if the mechanism designer fails to follow the mechanism later then this will be publicly known and hence punishable), and (b) the player can verify that the mechanism indeed is IR and IC.
2. *Direct revelation*: The player decides whether or not to participate, and if so, sends a message to the mechanism designer, revealing the player’s type.
3. *Running the mechanism*: The mechanism designer sends a message to the player, declaring the outcome. The player can then verify that the outcome is consistent with the mechanism that was fixed in the first message.

In contrast, with mechanism secrecy in mind, one may ideally be interested in a protocol along the lines of the following, too-good-to-be-true protocol:

1. *Commitment*: The mechanism designer sends a message (say, a sequence of numbers) to the player. By virtue of this message, (a) commitment is established (in the sense that a mechanism was fixed, and if the mechanism designer fails to follow the mechanism later then this will somehow be publicly known and hence punishable), and (b) the player

³For simplicity, in the introduction we focus on the case of one player.

can verify that the mechanism is indeed IR and IC. **However, this message must not reveal anything about the mechanism except for it being IR and IC.**

2. *Direct revelation:* The player decides whether or not to participate, and if so, sends a message to the mechanism designer, revealing the player’s type.
3. *Running the mechanism:* The mechanism designer sends a message to the player, declaring the outcome and containing additional information (say, a further sequence of numbers). By virtue of this additional information, the player can then ascertain that the outcome is consistent with the mechanism that was fixed when the first message was sent. **However, it must be that nothing observed by the player can reveal anything about the mechanism that would not have been revealed in the mediated protocol with a trusted, trustworthy to be truly discreet, mediator, i.e., anything beyond the mechanism being IR and IC, its outcome for the specific player’s type, and whatever can be inferred from the combination of these.**

We note that the desideratum is not for a limited commitment to parts of the mechanism while the designer can still change the rest, but for a *full* commitment, fixing the entire mechanism, yet revealing only certain facets of it.

Quite remarkably, despite economic theory usually unearthing tradeoffs, in this case we show that **no tradeoffs are needed**. That is, we show that the too-good-to-be-true hope of having a protocol as above turns out to be practically true (we make this precise momentarily). We construct a protocol that can be used to commit to, and run, **any mechanism, without disclosing it** but while **certifying its properties** (such as IR and IC). From the point of view of the players, participating in this protocol is **strategically equivalent to playing a direct-revelation mechanism** (just like playing through a mediator, as discussed above, is). The “only” difference between our protocol and traditional protocols is the way the mechanism is described and outcomes are certified, which provides the same secrecy guarantee to the seller as playing through a trusted, trustworthy mediator does—which can be thought of as a “first best” privacy—however without the need for any mediators, reliable or otherwise, and without the need for any preexisting trust between any parties.

To practically implement our protocol, we take a cryptographic approach. More precisely, we turn to zero-knowledge proofs, a cornerstone of modern cryptographic theory. At a *very* high level, the first message—the *commitment message*—contains a *cryptographic commitment* to the mechanism (not to be confused with the game-theoretic notion of commitment, even though in this paper the former implements the latter). One might intuitively think of this cryptographic commitment as an encrypted version of the mechanism.⁴ The commit-

⁴That said, at the technical level the requirements from commitments and encryptions are quite different.

ment message also contains a *zero-knowledge proof* that the commitment is to a mechanism that is IR and IC—and/or satisfies any other arbitrary properties that the mechanism designer wishes to expose, such as group strategyproofness, stability, etc. This zero-knowledge proof is a mathematical object that when examined, convinces the player beyond any reasonable doubt that the mechanism designer has created the cryptographic commitment by hiding a mechanism that satisfies the claimed properties, but reveals no other information about the mechanism. The additional information in the third message—the *run message*—then contains a *zero-knowledge proof* that the outcome really is the output of the mechanism committed to in the first message, when applied to the player’s type. Again, this is a mathematical object that when examined, convinces the player beyond any reasonable doubt that the mechanism designer has not only created the cryptographic commitment in the first message by hiding an IR and IC mechanism, but furthermore calculated the outcome by running this mechanism on the player’s declared type, but reveals no other information about the mechanism. We emphasize that the mechanism is never disclosed to anyone by the designer. Rather than a traditional commitment to an observed mechanism via verification of publicly observed signals (the mechanism announcement and the outcome announcement), we here have a *self-policing* commitment to a *never-observed mechanism*, yet (similarly to a traditional commitment) still via verification of publicly observed signals (in this case, the messages), and without the need for any mediator or preexisting trust. And yet, as noted, this is achieved without relying on any mediators and without changing the strategy space of any player, maintaining strategic equivalence to the traditional protocol by which the mechanism is publicly announced and then played. **In a precise sense, we decompose the classic notion of *commitment to a mechanism*, showing that disclosure of the mechanism is, in fact, not an essential part thereof.**

We say “practically true” and “practically implement” in the preceding paragraphs because like virtually any other cryptographic guarantee, there is some “fine print” involved. You, our reader, are most likely reading this introduction within a web browser. This web browser, near the URL (web-site address) of the paper, might display a lock sign, which you trust to mean that any communication between your computer and the web site is readable only by your computer and by the web site. While this is what the lock sign *practically* means, it is in fact not what it precisely means. What it precisely means is that (1) assuming that certain computational problems (such as factoring large numbers) are computationally hard, and (2) assuming that any eavesdropping third party does not have exceedingly high computational power (say, more than all computers in the world combined), and (3) barring an exceedingly unlikely lucky guess by an eavesdropping third party (intuitively, correctly guessing a strong encryption password), then any communication between your computer

and the web site is readable only by your computer and by the web site (barring any bug in the browser or web-site software that implements the cryptography, of course).⁵

Our two main guarantees for the protocol that we construct are *hiding*—the guarantee that the player learns no more than in the “first best” mediated protocol; and *committing*—the guarantee that if there is any violation by the mechanism designer (i.e., mechanism not IR or IC / not following the mechanism when calculating the outcome) then this becomes known to the player. Similarly to the above discussion on cryptographic guarantees, each of these two guarantees holds (1) under standard, widely believed assumptions that certain computational problems are computationally hard, and (2) assuming that the agents (the player for the hiding guarantee, the mechanism designer for the committing guarantee) do not have exceedingly high computational power, and (3) with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ over some event that neither the mechanism designer nor the player can influence.⁶ Naturally, what is considered “exceedingly high computational power,” and what ε is, are parameters of our construction.⁷

An important property of our protocol is that it is *feasibly computable*: the computational power required by “well behaved” agents (i.e., those who participate in the protocol without malice)—for the mechanism designer, this is the computational power of generating the commitment message and run message; for the player, this is the computational power of verifying the commitment message and run message (recall that our protocol is strategically equivalent to traditional ones, so the only message sent by the player is the single message that contains her type)—is smaller by many orders of magnitude than the computational power against which the protocol provides a guarantee. Moreover, the computational power required by well behaved agents increases exceedingly slowly as we decrease ε . In a precise sense, *well behaved agents that have moderate computational power get very strong guarantees against adversaries with exceedingly greater computing power*.

Admittedly, there are many components involved, which might be overwhelming. For this reason, before we start defining our model, in Section 2 we present four illustrative examples that we have constructed to provide a more gradual demonstration of how everything fits

⁵The guarantee with respect to point (3) is technically somewhat more nuanced, guaranteeing that the eavesdropper not get any nonnegligible “edge” (whether by guessing a password or otherwise).

⁶For the hiding definition, our guarantee with respect to point (3) is again—as in the web-browser privacy guarantee (see Footnote 5)—technically somewhat more nuanced, guaranteeing that players do not get an “edge” of more than ε in terms of their ability to discern between possible mechanisms. The protocols that we construct in Section 2 in fact provide a much stronger, unconditional “perfect hiding” guarantee that neither relies on computational assumptions or restrictions, nor allows for any “edge” or failure probability whatsoever. See also a discussion in Section 4.3.5

⁷Cryptographic constructions are usually not directly parametrized by an attacker’s computational power and success probability ε as ours are, but rather by a parameter called a “security parameter,” which in turn implies both of these values but is harder to interpret from an economic perspective, for which reason we avoid such a parametrization.

together. For each example, we consider a simple standard auction setting, and give a complete, self-contained construction of our protocol that does not rely on any cryptographic background, and delegates no part of the construction to external sources. To do this in a (relatively) simple, self-contained manner, we devise novel simple zero-knowledge proof techniques that are tailored to the specific examples. In particular, we provide a simple way to commit to numbers (e.g., prices) and to give zero-knowledge proofs of properties such as inequalities between these numbers. While this could be done using generic tools, the result would be considerably less intelligible. As we show, however, our novel construction easily generalizes also to arbitrarily complex committed information and proven properties. The resulting novel protocols, built using simple tools, are (relatively) accessible, very light computationally, and can be easily implemented in practice.

The examples in Section 2 also serve to demonstrate the notion of “what can be deduced from just the outcome of a mechanism.” The first example implements a simple mechanism that prices a single item at some price. In that example, if the item is sold, then the price is revealed (as part of the outcome), however if the item goes unsold, the price remains hidden and the buyer only learns that her bid was below the price (as can be inferred from the no-trade outcome). The second example considers a seller who prices two items for sale to a unit-demand buyer. Unlike in the first example, in this example it is never the case that all prices are revealed: Even if one of the items is sold, the price of the other remains hidden, with the buyer only learning that the hidden price is larger than some amount (as can be inferred solely from the outcome and from IC).

The mechanisms in these first two examples simply consist of item prices, and are therefore IR and IC by design. The third example deals with a richer parametrized family of mechanisms, not all of which are IC, and demonstrates the use of zero-knowledge proofs not only for the consistency of the outcome with the committed mechanism (as in the first two examples), but also for the mechanism being IC.

Finally, the fourth example involves randomized mechanisms. For a randomized mechanism in a *mediated* protocol, we can have the mechanism designer declare the realized outcome, and have the mediator not only guarantee mechanism properties and certify the correctness of calculations, but also vouch that the realized outcome that is declared to the player was fairly drawn from the outcome distribution (while keeping the outcome distribution hidden from the player). As the fourth example demonstrates, our framework (despite having no mediators) similarly allows for the player to only learn the *realized* outcome of a randomized mechanism, while still being convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that the randomization was performed fairly. (This once again utilizes zero-knowledge proofs.) In fact, one might view this example as *motivating* adding randomization to payments in order

to reduce the amount of information revealed about the mechanism: Instead of charging, say, \$17 for an item, one can charge \$1000 with probability $17/1000$ without hurting incentives. Then, the buyer only sees a realized price of \$0 or \$1000, and because the distribution is hidden, does not know the real price with certainty.

We emphasize that our framework goes far beyond these four examples, and is completely general in terms of the settings and mechanisms hidden, with no functional-form restrictions whatsoever. To give just two starkly different examples, our framework can be used on the one hand to hide minute details of far more complex mechanisms (e.g., hide the details of a complex multi-dimensional randomized screening mechanism), and on the other hand to hide major qualitative features of mechanisms (e.g., in a matching setting, hide whether the mechanism that is run is Serial Dictatorship, Deferred Acceptance, or Top Trading Cycles).

After reviewing preliminaries and formalizing the traditional and mediated protocols in Section 3, in Section 4 we provide our main results (for general mechanisms). We note that while eliminating third parties from various settings is a decades-long high-level agenda in cryptography (perhaps analogously to revenue maximization in economics), it is always the case that “god is in the details” in terms of what precisely can be guaranteed and proven, how, and in which setting. This is further compounded by the fact that our definitions and guarantees are stated in quite a starkly different manner than any analogues of them (for other contexts) would be in the cryptographic literature; indeed, our modeling and desiderata are designed to put economic usefulness front and center.

In Section 5, we show that our framework applies equally also to contract-design settings with moral hazard (i.e., mechanisms with private actions rather than private types).⁸ Using our framework, a principal can commit to **any contract** while proving arbitrary properties of the contract (such as IR, limited liability, and what the optimal level of effort to exert is), and eventually also prove that the contract was adhered to (i.e., that the wage paid is as specified by the contract for the publicly observable realized returns), all without revealing to the agent who agrees to the contract any further information about the contract (except what can be inferred from the combination of the proven properties and the realized returns and wage).⁹ For example, a common form of contract for a principal to offer to an agent is a constant fraction of the overall revenue (returns less the principal’s cost). Using our framework, a principal can commit to follow such a contract that is hidden from the agent, however prove to the agent that the contract is of this functional form and incentivizes effort (i.e., that the wage expected by the agent if investing effort covers the agent’s effort costs),

⁸Our framework applies also to mechanisms with both private types and private actions.

⁹Ederer et al. (2018) identify settings in which ex-ante committing to an “opaque contract” strictly dominates the best transparent contract. Our framework allows to create such a commitment without any mediators or preexisting trust.

and eventually prove that the contract was adhered to. The agent would eventually learn the overall returns and her wage, however would learn neither the precise fraction of the revenue that she got nor the principal’s precise cost (she would only learn some joint function of both of these values). These details, of the contract that the agent accepted, would remain forever hidden from the agent. Hiding contracts also allows a principal to hire several agents without allowing them to compare the detailed terms of their contracts.¹⁰

There is, of course, prior literature, mostly within computer science, that aims to apply cryptography to economics. Closest to our paper is the literature within mechanism design that focuses on the privacy of player types/valuations (for auctions, see, e.g., Brandt, 2006; Parkes et al., 2008, 2009; Micali and Rabin, 2014; Ferreira and Weinberg, 2020; and see Bogetoft et al., 2009 for a real-life application to auctioning allowances for growing sugar beets in Denmark; for matching mechanisms, see, e.g., Doerner et al., 2016; for more general mechanisms, see Izmalkov et al., 2011; see Haupt and Hitzig, 2022 for a non-cryptographic approach). In these papers, however, the mechanism is *commonly known*, and the challenge is to run this commonly known mechanism without revealing the types of the players. Our focus is different, conceptually and technically: We focus on the secrecy of *the mechanism itself*, which introduces new challenges such as proving/certifying certain properties of the hidden information (e.g., IR and IC; or IR, limited liability, and the optimal level of effort to exert). In the age of social networks, it is indeed not far fetched to have settings in which companies value their privacy considerably more than users do.

Another feature of this previous literature on cryptography and economics is that hiding the players’ types without a mediator or physical means involves enlarging the action spaces of players, which creates theoretical room for various threats, and hence degrades strategic properties. In contrast, our framework allows for clear separation between the cryptographic and game-theoretic layers: Our protocols—despite hiding the mechanism—are direct-revelation protocols, strategically equivalent to simply running the mechanism using traditional protocols, precisely preserving its incentive properties. In Section 5, we also describe an extensions of our framework that combines our approach with that of this previous literature, to hide both the mechanism and type reports.

Also at the interface of cryptography and economics is the exploding study of blockchain protocols such as Bitcoin and Ethereum, reviewing even a small portion thereof would be outside of the scope of this paper. We do note that there currently are no established ways to hide mechanisms on top of blockchains. One could certainly deploy the machinery that we develop in this paper on top of a blockchain to give such capabilities (e.g., enrich smart

¹⁰Cullen and Perez-Truglia (2022) find that an increase in employees’ perception of their peers’ salaries has a negative causal effect on effort and performance.

contracts to implement protocols such as those described here). We emphasize that running a blockchain involves a complex infrastructure and monetary reward model that give rise to intricate incentives, all of which are not at all required for our machinery. Indeed, our machinery does not compound any extraneous incentive on top of those originally in the mechanism that is run. Furthermore, in stark contrast with running a blockchain, the computational resources required by all of the illustrative examples that we give in Section 2 are so low that they could be directly run even on the buyer’s and seller’s wristwatches.

Section 5 also introduces extensions beyond mechanism design. First, we describe how players can commit to hidden strategies in sequential games while only proving certain properties of these strategies. Second, we show how to implement (without a trusted mediator) a correlated equilibrium that is known *only* to a principal and to none of the players, by proving only obedience to the players via zero-knowledge proofs.¹¹

While we leave unmodeled the reason for the desired secrecy of the mechanism, we do note that one possible motivation is a scenario with multiple stages or repeated interaction, such as bargaining.¹² In such a setting, absent a mediator who is mutually (rightfully) trusted to be neutral and keep offers secret, making an offer is traditionally seen as inherently linked with disclosing information. Our framework decouples the identity of the party making the offer from that of the party disclosing information, by allowing the former to make arbitrarily complex or detailed offers (captured, e.g., by proposing an IR and IC mechanism) without disclosing them (with only the receiving side disclosing information as she responds to the offer, or, via an extension that we describe, even with no side disclosing information). That is, in a precise sense, our framework allows pooling even by parties making different offers. Concretely, Čopić and Ponsatí (2008) study a bilateral-trade problem with incomplete information and show that bargaining through a neutral, mutually trusted mediator who keeps offers hidden might increase welfare;¹³ our framework provides a path to the same benefit without the need for a mediator. As another example, Hörner and Vieille (2009) consider a market-for-lemons bargaining setting with correlated values, and show that keeping offers hidden until they are accepted, the process is more likely to reach agreement; once again, our framework provides a path to the same benefit without a mediator. In both of these examples, the secrecy obtained through using our framework translates into increased gains for all, compared to what has been previously known to be achievable absent a neutral, mutually trusted mediator.

¹¹Dodis et al. (2000, 2007) and Katz (2008) leverage cryptography to implement a *commonly known* correlated equilibrium by replacing a mediator with cheap talk (see also Ben-Porath, 1998 and Gerardi, 2004, who tackle a similar problem using non-cryptographic assumptions such as a larger number of players).

¹²Repeated-interactions settings are also very appropriate as it is well known that in such settings, commitment can be sustained if deviations are identifiable (as is the case in our framework).

¹³Jarque et al. (2003) also analyze bargaining through a neutral, mutually trusted mediator who observes the offers from both sides yet keeps them hidden.

Relevant applications with multiple stages within mechanism design could include a setting with an aftermarket (Dworczak, 2020) with the added feature of the seller also participating in the aftermarket (and therefore interested in keeping her information hidden). Also within mechanism design, while our framework does not have any direct bearing on equilibrium analysis in the informed designer/principal problem, we note that it can be used to remove the need for a mediator to run the designer’s chosen mechanism, as well as remove the requirement for common knowledge of the designer’s type space.

Finally, we touch upon an application of a different kind. The *communication requirements* of mechanisms have received attention in both economics and computer science (Nisan and Segal, 2006; Segal, 2007; Dobzinski, 2016; Gonczarowski, 2018; Gonczarowski et al., 2019b; Rubinstein and Zhao, 2021; Rubinstein et al., 2021; Babaioff et al., 2022). All of these papers study the communication requirements of running a *commonly known mechanism*. But what if the mechanism is not ex-ante known to the players? For a selling mechanism for a single buyer (essentially, a menu), absent any *a priori* structure on the mechanism, the communication required to describe the mechanism is the size of its menu—exponentially larger than just running it (Babaioff, Gonczarowski, and Nisan, 2022). Our framework, however, provides a way to prove that the mechanism is IR and IC before running it, without communicating the entire menu. As we show in Section 4.3.4, leveraging a state-of-the-art variant of zero-knowledge proofs known as ZK-SNARKs, we can in fact reduce the communication requirements of our zero-knowledge protocols to be polylogarithmic in the size of the mechanism description (that is, a polynomial of the logarithm of its size—smaller than its size by orders of magnitude), i.e., on par with the communication requirement of running the direct-revelation mechanism if it were already commonly known. It was previously unknown how to achieve such a dramatic reduction in the communication requirements of mechanisms even when secrecy is not required.

While our framework is theoretically sound for use by “Homo economicus” agents, one may rightfully wonder regarding applicability of our framework for real-life use. To answer this question, we recall one success story of introducing as-technical cryptography into mass use: that of web-browser communication encryption, symbolized by the browser’s lock sign. Users who surf the World Wide Web are spared from directly interacting with the intricate mathematics required for encrypting their browser communication, since the browser software handles all of the math. The browser software itself is (rightfully) trusted by users because it is written by a well-reputable party and audited by many independent experts. Note, however, that this well-reputable party is not a mediator in the traditional sense: it is never entrusted with the browser communication; this communication only exists unencrypted on the user’s computers and on the web-site server. This model has worked

successfully for three decades, and a very similar model could be used for implementing the machinery in this paper: A well-reputable party could write the software for the mechanism designer and players, which would be audited by independent experts.¹⁴ The mechanism description would exist unencrypted only on the mechanism designer’s computer, yet its properties and outcome would be (rightfully) trusted by all users.¹⁵

1.1 Contributions

As this paper builds upon techniques in cryptography to derive economic results, it might be hard for either cryptographers or economists to fully elucidate its contributions. It is therefore worthwhile to emphasize several facets of our contribution:

- **A further distillation and decomposition of (economic) commitment.** The concept of *commitment* in economics, at least when there is no preexisting trust or reputation, is by and large thought of as implying full disclosure. By decoupling commitment from disclosure—constructing committing and hiding protocols while maintaining strategic equivalence—our results shed a new light on this fundamental concept.
- **Modeling, definitions, protocols, and corresponding proofs.** The ways by which we model our protocols, and our desiderata on them, are novel. In particular, in order to convey their respective economic meanings, our desiderata had to be formalized substantially differently than standard cryptographic definitions that serve any analogous technical purposes in other models. Our proofs, in turn, have to navigate this gap (e.g., our results could be contrasted with the more standard cryptographic results from Appendix C, upon which we build). Throughout this paper, footnotes that discuss noteworthy departures from standard cryptographic formalisms, and which are aimed at readers with background in cryptography or who are interested in more technical discussions of contrasts with standard cryptography, are marked with a wrench sign.¹⁶
- **Accessible, illustrative, practical examples.** The cryptographic construction of our examples from Section 2 is novel and completely general, yet built from first principles. These examples both illustrate the ideas of this paper without requiring any background in cryptography, and are readily applicable.
- **A new application for zero-knowledge cryptography.** A main challenge in find-

¹⁴This could possibly even be part of the browser software in the case of online auctions, where an icon similar to the browser’s lock sign—perhaps a stylized check mark (leveraging its older sibling icon’s decade-old credibility)—would confirm the validity of claims made by the designer.

¹⁵In this setting, our results guarantee that the mechanism description is kept secret even if players use any other software, and the mechanism properties and outcome can be relied on even if the mechanism designer uses any other software. Each user need only trust that the software she is using is coded properly (as one trusts any other software on one’s computer).

¹⁶See, e.g., the footnotes on our definition of implementing, hiding, and committing (Definitions 4.1 to 4.3).

ing real-life applications of zero-knowledge proofs is that in many potential applications, it is unclear what *precisely* the formal statement one wishes to prove is. (Such clarity is crucial since one learns nothing beyond the correctness of this specific precise formal statement.) Our paper identifies a domain in which for half a century there has been wide consensus regarding what the precise formal statement of interest is (IC and IR).

2 Illustrative Examples

Proceeding straight to our model, as is customary, might in this specific paper feel unsatisfactory intuition-wise for many readers, especially those without background in cryptography. We therefore defer doing so to Section 3. In this section, rather, we present a sequence of four examples, all within fundamental auction settings, each gradually building on its predecessor and illustrating an additional key property of our framework. In each example, we give a complete, self-contained construction. To do so, we devise novel zero-knowledge proof techniques tailored to these specific examples. The resulting novel protocols, are not only (relatively) accessible, but also very light computationally and easily implementable in practice.

The first two examples demonstrate the idea of a commitment to a hidden mechanism along with a zero-knowledge proof of properly running it. The third example shows how one goes about proving that a hidden committed mechanism satisfies any property of interest (in that example, incentive compatibility). Finally, the fourth example deals with randomized mechanisms: mechanisms that map buyer reports to *distributions* over outcomes. This example shows how to ensure that the buyer learns nothing about the mechanism *or even the distribution*, except for the realized outcome—a single draw from this distribution.

While the constructions described in this section provably guarantee strong properties, our goal in this section is to give sufficient information and intuition for understanding why the desirable properties are satisfied, without fully formalizing these properties. The properties are defined formally in Section 4.3, where our main result on the existence of a general construction is given. In Appendix A, we prove in full detail that these properties hold for the first two examples in the current section; the proofs for the latter two examples are similar, so we do not repeat them.

2.1 Illustrative Example 1: Commitment to Hidden Mechanism & Zero-Knowledge Proof of Properly Running It

We start with the simplest possible example within an auction setting: a seller offering an item to a buyer for some price¹⁷. The buyer has a private value v for the item, and the seller wishes to commit to a price $s \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$ for some commonly known H ; for simplicity, we

¹⁷We avoid the term “posted price” since the price will not be posted anywhere.

assume that H is a power of 2. The challenge is that the price should remain hidden if trade does not take place. More specifically, the buyer should learn nothing about s before disclosing v , and if trade does not take place, then the buyer should at no point learn more about s than the fact that it is greater than v (which is immediate from trade not taking place). The buyer should, of course, be convinced that there really is a commitment here, i.e., that the seller has no way to alter the (hidden) price after she has set it. We describe the process by which the seller commits to the price, and then describe the process by which she proves that the outcome that she announces (i.e., whether trade takes place and at which price) correctly corresponds to the hidden price. The guaranteed properties of these processes rely on an algebraic construction, for which we first give some background, which we also use in later examples in this section.¹⁸

Algebraic setup Let p be a large prime such that $q=2p+1$ is also prime (e.g., $p=3$ and $q=7$, however for much bigger primes).¹⁹ Let $G=\{h^2 \bmod q \mid h \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be the set of all square integers modulo q . For every $g \in G \setminus \{1\}$, it is well known that $g^p \bmod q = 1$ and that this is not true for any smaller positive power of g .²⁰ All henceforth operations involving elements of G are modulo q .²¹ Since for every $g \in G \setminus \{1\}$, the smallest positive power of g that equals 1 is p , any such g is a *generator* of G , i.e., for every such g and every $h \in G$ there exists a unique $\ell \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $h = g^\ell$. This ℓ is called the *discrete logarithm (in G) of h base g* . It is widely believed by cryptographers and computational complexity theorists that if G is large, then for uniformly random $g, h \in G \setminus \{1\}$ it is a hard problem to calculate the discrete logarithm of h base g , that is, it is (computationally) *infeasible* to do so with non-negligible probability (corresponding, e.g., to an extremely lucky very-low-probability guess

¹⁸While this algebraic setup might at first glance make our examples seem impractical, we note that the same could have been equally (if not more so) said in the 1990s about the cryptography that powers the web browser with which you have securely accessed this paper. As discussed in the introduction, just as the latter entered mainstream use, we conjecture that so could our techniques.

¹⁹Such a prime p is called a *Sophie Germain prime* and such a prime q is called a *safe prime*. Since we are interested in a large group—whose elements are infeasible to enumerate one by one—a better example than $p=3$ and $q=7$ would be, e.g., as it turns out, $p = 2618163402417 \cdot 2^{1290000} - 1$ and $q = 2618163402417 \cdot 2^{1290001} - 1$, which, as of July 2021, are the largest known primes with this property (though infinitely many are conjectured to exist). See <https://primes.utm.edu/primes/page.php?id=121330> and <https://primes.utm.edu/primes/page.php?id=121331>.

²⁰The first part is true because by construction $g = h^2 \bmod q$ for some h , and by Fermat's little theorem, $g^p \bmod q = h^{q-1} \bmod q = 1$ because q is prime. For the second part, let $\ell > 0$ be the smaller positive integer such that $g^\ell \bmod q = 1$. ℓ must divide p since otherwise the greatest common denominator of ℓ and p would be an even smaller such integer. Since p is prime, $\ell = p$.

²¹The set G , which we use for simplicity of exposition, is a well-known special case of an (*algebraic*) group of some large prime *order* p . Our protocols would work with any such group, and in fact, with any group of prime order where computing discrete logarithms is hard, such as elliptic curve groups, which are used by most major encryption systems around the world.

of the discrete logarithm).²² The guaranteed properties in this pricing example will follow from this infeasibility: Were anyone able to circumvent these properties, they would also be immediately able to feasibly solve this problem, disproving its hardness. We note that the security of most standard current cryptographic schemes for protecting internet communication hinges on this infeasibility. That is, anyone able to feasibly solve this computational problem would be able to break into most bank accounts in the world.

Commitment scheme The commitment process is as follows: nature draws two elements $g, h \in G \setminus \{1\}$ uniformly at random, from which point g and h are commonly known. To commit to a price $s \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$, write s in binary representation: $s = s_1 \dots s_{\log_2 H}$, i.e., $s = \sum_{i=1}^{\log_2 H} s_i \cdot 2^{\log_2 H - i}$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, the seller independently draws $\rho_i \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$, and calculates the *commitment* C_i to the bit s_i as $C_i = g^{\rho_i}$ if $s_i = 0$, and as $C_i = h^{\rho_i}$ if $s_i = 1$. (Recall that these powers are modulo q .) The seller then sends $(C_1, \dots, C_{\log_2 H})$ to the buyer as a *commitment* to the (unknown to the buyer) price s . Why do we consider this a hiding commitment? First, regarding hiding: For each i , when ρ_i is drawn uniformly at random, for any generator f of G the value f^{ρ_i} is a uniformly random element of G , and hence without knowing ρ_i , the value f^{ρ_i} leaks no information whatsoever about f . Second, regarding commitment: Our arguments later will hinge on the fact that (with high probability over the draw of g and h) the seller is unable to come up with values ρ_i, ρ'_i such that $g^{\rho_i} = C_i$ and at the same time $h^{\rho'_i} = C_i$. Indeed, if the seller could have come up with such ρ_i, ρ'_i then she could have feasibly calculated²³ $\ell = \rho'_i \cdot \rho_i^{-1} \mod p$, which satisfies $h = g^\ell$, and hence such a seller would have succeeded in feasibly calculating the discrete logarithm of h base g . As mentioned above, if this could have been done with nonnegligible probability, then the seller could have immediately adapted this procedure to break into most bank accounts in the world.

Proof of properly running the hidden mechanism After the seller sends the commitment a to the buyer, the buyer discloses her value v . If the price s is no more than v , then the seller discloses s along with the values ρ_i , which allow the buyer to verify the value of s (recall that the seller only knows how to “open” each bit to 0 or to 1 but not to both), and trade takes place at price s . Contrawise, if the price s is more than v then the seller must prove to the buyer that this is the case, without disclosing any additional information

²²For simplicity, the protocols described in this section are under the assumption that no agent (seller or buyer) has access to a quantum computer. Should quantum computers become a reality, then these protocols would need to be modified, as such computers are expected to be able to feasibly calculate discrete logarithms (Shor, 1997). There are several alternative “quantum safe” hard problems on which cryptography can be based (Bernstein and Lange, 2017; National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 2022). In practice, such alternatives have not replaced standard cryptographic algorithms in any major application (e.g., the encryption used by web browsers is not quantum safe).

²³Unlike discrete logarithms, the inverse $\rho_i^{-1} \mod p$ is easy to feasibly calculate: by Fermat’s little theorem, $\rho_i^{p-1} \mod p = 1$ because p is prime, and therefore, $\rho_i^{-1} \mod p = \rho_i^{p-2} \mod p$.

about s . We now describe how this is done.

Before we continue, consider for a moment two numbers in binary representation, $x = x_1 \dots x_{\log_2 H}$ and $y = y_1 \dots y_{\log_2 H}$. Observe that $x < y$ if and only if there exists an i such that both (1) $x_i < y_i$ and (2) $x_j \leq y_j$ for all $j < i$. Rephrasing this statement, $x \geq y$ if and only if for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, either $x_i \geq y_i$, or else there exists some $j < i$ such that $x_j > y_j$. Equivalently, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$ such that $y_i = 1$, either $x_i = 1$ or else $x_j = 1$ for some $j < i$ such that $y_j = 0$.

Back to our seller and buyer, let $v_1 \dots v_{\log_2 H}$ be the binary representation of $v+1$. To prove that $s > v$, or equivalently that $s \geq v+1$ (where v is commonly known and s is given implicitly via the commitment $(C_1, \dots, C_{\log_2 H})$), by the previous paragraph it suffices for the seller to prove, for each i such that $v_i = 1$, that either $s_i = 1$ or else $s_j = 1$ for some $j < i$ such that $v_j = 0$. That is, for each such i it suffices for the seller to prove that she knows the discrete logarithm base h of at least one of $\{C_j \mid j = i \vee (j < i \wedge v_j = 0)\}$. Fortunately, a procedure for an agent to prove that she knows a discrete logarithm with a given base of one of a set of numbers, without revealing anything about for which of those numbers she knows this, is well known (Cramer et al., 1994). Specifically, there is a procedure that has the following three properties. First, there is only negligible probability that a seller who does not know the discrete logarithm base h of any number in the set does not get discovered during this procedure. Second, the procedure reveals nothing beyond the seller knowing the discrete logarithm base h of one of the numbers in the set. Third, participating in the procedure requires only modest computational power and communication. For completeness, this procedure is given in Appendix A.1. The full details of our construction for Illustrative Example 1, along with proof that this construction satisfies all of the properties of our main result from Section 4.3, are given in Appendix A.

On interaction The main difference between this example (as well as the examples below) and what our general framework guarantees is that in this example, the final proof is interactive, i.e., the procedure for proving knowledge of a discrete log actively involves the buyer, and in particular involves the buyer sending a random message (drawn by the buyer) to the seller. While adding interaction might in general introduce game-theoretic complications as it enlarges the strategy space and allows for various threats, this is not a problem here, even if there are multiple buyers, as all buyers finish disclosing their types already before this point, so no threats are possible. Nonetheless, in our general construction any interaction here is avoided, and the proof of properly running the hidden mechanism consists of a single message sent by the seller. Our general framework provably achieves this via a more elaborate cryptographic scheme. One way in which this could be achieved in this example and those below, at least in practice, using the above cryptographic scheme, is to replace the random message sent by the buyer with bits obtained by applying a cryptographic hash function to all previous seller messages; as these bits are not known before those messages

are constructed, they are in some sense “random enough from the point of view of when messages are constructed.” This technique, known as the *Fiat–Shamir transform* (Fiat and Shamir, 1986), is used by countless real-life cryptographic systems.

2.1.1 Multiple Buyers

In the above example we focused on one buyer for simplicity, however everything described, with no material change, can also be used to implement a second-price auction with the price as a reserve. Indeed, once the type reports are common knowledge, so is the highest bidder. There are then three possible scenarios:

- The reserve price is above the highest bid. In this case, the seller proves this without revealing the hidden reserve, as in the single-buyer setting, and no trade takes place.
- The reserve price is weakly below the highest bid, and strictly above the second-highest bid. In this case, the seller reveals the reserve price as in the single-buyer setting, and trade takes place at this price.
- The reserve price is weakly below the second-highest bid. In this case, the seller proves this without revealing the hidden reserve, and trade takes place with the second-highest bid as price. While the inequality to be proved here is in the reverse direction to that proved in the single-buyer setting, an analogous technique still works: if the (hidden) price is $s = s_1 \dots s_{\log_2 H}$ and the second-highest bid is $v^{(2)} = v_1^{(2)} \dots v_{\log_2 H}^{(2)}$, then the seller proves that for each i such that $v_i^{(2)} = 0$, either $s_i = 0$ or else $s_j = 0$ for some $j < i$ with $v_j^{(2)} = 1$.

Since it is commonly known that only the highest bidder might possibly participate in trade, we can have the seller reveal/prove the above either to all bidders or only to the highest bidder.

2.2 Illustrative Example 2: Never Fully Reveal

A simplifying feature of Illustrative Example 1 is that if the item is sold, then the mechanism is fully revealed. Our next example is arguably one of the simplest ones within an auction setting that do not exhibit this feature. Here we have a seller offering not one but two items to a unit-demand buyer, each at some price. The buyer has a private value v_i for each item $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and the seller wishes to commit to two prices $s^1, s^2 \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$ for a commonly known H . Sale takes place if $v_i \geq s^i$ for some i , and the item sold is an item whose sale maximizes the buyer’s utility.

The requirement here is that the price of any unsold item (and since the buyer has unit demand, there always is at least one unsold item) should remain hidden. More specifically, the buyer should learn nothing about any price before disclosing v ; if no trade takes place,

then the buyer should learn nothing except that $s^1 > v_1$ and $s^2 > v_2$ (which is once again immediate from no trade taking place). Alternately, if some trade does take place, then the buyer only learns that the price of the unsold item (item i) is high enough so that if the buyer were to purchase that item at that price, then the resulting utility would be no greater than that from buying the item actually sold (item j) at its price, that is, $s^i \geq s^j - v_j + v_i$.

The construction in this case is very similar to that of Illustrative Example 1. The seller commits to $2\log_2 H$ rather than $\log_2 H$ bits (each bit of each of the two prices) using precisely the same scheme. After the buyer discloses her values v_1, v_2 , if any item is sold then the seller reveals its price (along with the random values used to create the commitments), and for any item i not sold, the seller has to prove that s^i is weakly greater than some commonly known value: either that $s^i \geq v_i + 1$ if the other item is not sold, or that $s^i \geq s^j - v_j + v_i$ if the other item j is sold. This is done using the same interactive procedure as in Illustrative Example 1. The full details of our construction for Illustrative Example 2, along with proof that this construction satisfies all of the properties of our main result from Section 4.3, are once again given in Appendix A.

2.3 Illustrative Example 3:

Zero-Knowledge Proof of Incentive Compatibility

A simplifying feature of Illustrative Examples 1 and 2 is that every mechanism that could be committed to using the schemes in these examples is inherently IC (and IR). Our next example is arguably one of the simplest ones within an auction setting that do not exhibit this feature. Here we again have a seller offering an item to a buyer, however not at a single price. Rather, there is a price s^1 for the initial 0.5 probability of winning the item, and a price s^2 for the remaining 0.5 probability of winning. More specifically, the mechanism is defined as follows, where v is the value reported by the buyer:

- If $v/2 < s^1$, then buyer gets nothing and pays nothing.
- Otherwise, if $v/2 < s^2$ then buyer gets the item with probability 0.5 and pays s^1 . (In this example, we assume the lottery that awards the item with probability 0.5 is held publicly. This need not be case—see the next example.)
- Otherwise, the buyer gets the item with probability 1 and pays $s^1 + s^2$.

Lemma 2.1. *This mechanism is IC if and only if $s^1 \leq s^2$.*

Proof. If $s^1 \leq s^2$, then $v/2 < s^1$ implies $v < s^1 + s^2$, so case analysis shows that the buyer always gets the utility-maximizing outcome by reporting truthfully. Otherwise, $s^1 + s^2 < 2s^1$, so for every $v \in (s^1 + s^2, 2s^1)$, the buyer has an incentive to misreport by claiming her value is $2s^1$, since truthful reporting gets her nothing (utility 0) but reporting $2s^1$ gets her the item for

sure (utility $v - (s^1 + s^2) > 0$). □

By this lemma, the requirement in this example is that after committing to s^1 and s^2 , the buyer must learn that $s^1 \leq s^2$ but learn no more than that. Analogously to the previous two examples, if the buyer pays nothing and gets nothing, then the buyer must learn that $v/2 < s^1$ but learn no more than that, if the buyer gets the item with probability 0.5 for a price of s^1 , then the buyer must learn the value of s^1 and that $v/2 < s^2$ but learn no more than that, and if the buyer gets the item with probability 1 for a price of $s^1 + s^2$, then the buyer must learn the value of $s^1 + s^2$, but learn no more than that.

Most of the construction in this case is again similar to that of the previous examples. We use the same commitment scheme to commit to each of the bits of each of s^1 and s^2 . Each of the inequalities that might have to be proven after the outcome is chosen (i.e., the inequalities showing that one of the prices is greater than the then-commonly-known $v/2$) can be proven by the seller as in the previous examples, and any price can be revealed as in the previous examples. There are therefore two added challenges: proving the inequality $s^1 \leq s^2$ between the two hidden prices, and proving what $s^1 + s^2$ is without revealing any additional information about s^1 or s^2 . We will now explain how to do each of these. Let $s^1 = s_1^1 \dots s_{\log_2 H}^1$ $s^2 = s_1^2 \dots s_{\log_2 H}^2$ be the binary representations of the two prices and let $C_1^1, \dots, C_{\log_2 H}^1, C_1^2, \dots, C_{\log_2 H}^2$ be the respective commitments to the bits.

We start with proving that $s^1 \leq s^2$. Similarly to the proofs above, we will show that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, either $s_i^1 \leq s_i^2$ or there exists $j < i$ such that $s_i^1 < s_i^2$. That is, we have to prove that for every i , one of the following three options holds: (a) $s_i^1 = 0$, or, (b) $s_i^2 = 1$, or, (c) there exists $j < i$ such that both $s_j^1 = 0$ and $s_j^2 = 1$. That is, for every such i the seller should prove that she knows one of the following three: (a) the discrete log base g of C_i^1 , or, (b) the discrete log base h of C_i^2 , or, (c) for some $j < i$, both the discrete log base g of C_j^1 and the discrete log base h of C_j^2 . While this is a strictly more general form of statement than used previously (“the seller knows the log base h of one of a given set of elements of G ”), in Appendix A.1.3 we describe a new extension of the procedure used for proving the simpler form of statement used previously, for this more general form of statement. This procedure maintains all of the desired properties.

The final challenge is proving what the value of $s^1 + s^2$ is (in case the buyer gets the item with probability 1). Let $s = s_1, \dots, s_{\log_2 H}$ be the binary representation of $s^1 + s^2$. Inductively define the “carry” bits $c_1, \dots, c_{\log_2 H}$ used in the calculation of $s^1 + s^2$: for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, we define $c_i = 1$ if and only if at least two of the following three conditions hold: (a) $s_i^1 = 1$, (b) $s_i^2 = 1$, (c) both $i < H$ and $c_{i+1} = 1$.

The seller commits to each of these $\log_2 H$ carry bits using the same commitment scheme, and uses these commitments to prove in zero knowledge that each step of the calculation

of $s^1 + s^2$ was properly executed. To see how this can be done, consider for example how one might prove that s_5 and c_5 were properly calculated. Let C_5^1, C_5^2, C_5', C_6' be the respective commitments to s_5^1, s_5^2, c_5, c_6 . We must show that $s_5 = s_5^1 + s_5^2 + c_6 \pmod{2}$ and that c_5 satisfies its above inductive definition. Ergo, we must prove that (s_5^1, s_5^2, c_5, c_6) is one of four specific valid quadruplets $(b_{1,1}, \dots, b_{1,4}), \dots, (b_{4,1}, \dots, b_{4,4})$ (which quadruplets are the four valid ones depends on the value of s_5 , which the seller sends to the buyer). Defining $g_{i,j} = g$ if $b_{i,j} = 0$ and $g_{i,j} = h$ otherwise, this is equivalent to showing that there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ for which the seller knows (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_4) such that $g_{i,1}^{\rho_1} = C_5^1$, $g_{i,2}^{\rho_2} = C_5^2$, $g_{i,3}^{\rho_3} = C_5'$, and $g_{i,4}^{\rho_4} = C_6'$. This form of statement (“there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ for which the seller knows (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_m) such that $g_{i,j}^{\rho_j} = C_{i,j}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, m$,” where $g_{i,j}$ and $C_{i,j}$ are commonly known elements in G for every i, j) is a further generalization of the one used for proving that $s^1 \leq s^2$, and yet our new extension from Appendix A.1.3 of the procedure used for proving the simpler form of statements used so far can prove such statements as well. As noted above, the remainder of the full details of our construction of Illustrative Example 3, along with the proof that this construction satisfies all of the properties of our main result from Section 4.3, are analogous to those given in Appendix A for the previous examples.

While committing to carry bits might seem to be very specialized for calculating sums, we note that the method described for proving the value of $s^1 + s^2$ is in fact completely general: It can be used to prove the proper computation of any function whatsoever, of any number of committed values, by simply committing to all of the “intermediate bits” of the computation of the function, and using our new generalized procedure from Appendix A.1.3 to prove that each intermediate bit is properly calculated. Therefore, for any way of describing (single- or multi-buyer) mechanisms using bits (be it as general as the code of a Python program that defines the mechanism), if the seller commits to each such bit using our commitment scheme, then our new generalized procedure from Appendix A.1.3 can be used to prove that the described mechanism is IC and IR, and after buyer types are reported and the outcome announced, that the committed mechanism was properly run.

We remark that in settings in which the outcome naturally specifies an individual outcome for each buyer (e.g., what she gets and how much she pays, or what her match is), then instead of announcing the entire outcome to all buyers and proving that it is indeed the result of the committed mechanism, the seller could announce to each buyer only her individual outcome, and prove to her only that it is indeed her individual part of the outcome resulting from the committed mechanism, revealing no additional information about the other parts of the outcome.

2.4 Illustrative Example 4: Zero-Knowledge Proof of Properly Running a Randomized Mechanism

A simplifying feature of Illustrative Examples 1, 2, and 3 is that only the deterministic part of the mechanism is hidden, that is, either the mechanism is deterministic and only the outcome is revealed, or it is randomized and the full outcome distribution (rather than merely the realized outcome) is revealed (followed by public coin flipping to draw the realized outcome). Our next example is arguably one of the simplest ones within an auction setting that do not exhibit this feature. It also motivates the use of randomness within mechanisms for secrecy, even when a deterministic mechanism with the same revenue exists.²⁴

Here, as in Illustrative Example 1, we again have a seller offering an item to a buyer for some hidden price s , however the price is only in expectation, i.e., if trade takes place then instead of the buyer paying s with certainty, the buyer pays H (recall that H is an upper bound on the buyer's valuation) with probability s/H and pays 0 otherwise. The challenge is that s should remain hidden even if trade takes place, revealing only the realized payment.²⁵ The buyer should be convinced not only that there really is a commitment to the price, but also that the payment is the result of a fair draw.

Our commitment scheme for this example is again the same, and like in Illustrative Examples 1 and 2, no proof that the mechanism is IC (or IR) is needed. Let v be the buyer's reported value. If $v < s$, then the seller proves so (i.e., proves that $v+1 \leq s$) as in Illustrative Example 1. If, on the other hand, $v \geq s$, then the seller first proves that this holds (as in the multiple-buyer case of Illustrative Example 1). It remains to show how, given commitments to the bits of s , a coin with a heads probability of s/H can be verifiably flipped without the buyer learning anything about s except for the realized outcome.

The seller draws a uniformly random number $x = x_1 \dots x_{\log_2 H} \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$ and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, sends a commitment R_i to x_i and a commitment R'_i to $1 - x_i$, and proves to the buyer that she knows the log base g of one of R_i and R'_i and the log base h of one of R_i and R'_i , without revealing any additional information.²⁶ The buyer then draws a uni-

²⁴Prior literature uses randomization when, unlike in our case, it can differently incentivize the agent and therefore increase the principal's revenue/utility from the mechanism beyond what is attainable with deterministic mechanisms (Maskin and Tirole, 1990; Kamenica and Gentzkow, 2011; Daskalakis et al., 2014). In those cases, unlike in our case, there is also no need to maintain secrecy after the agent acts.

²⁵This might allow a Bayesian buyer to somewhat update her prior over the price, but she will not learn s for certain. Replacing a price with an expectation-equivalent distribution supported on one low value and one high value was also utilized in Rubinstein and Zhao (2021), however in order to save on communication rather than to hide information.

²⁶Since it is assumed that the seller cannot know the log of any commitment in both bases, this means that the seller knows the log base g of one of the commitments and the log base h of the other, i.e., they are indeed commitments to some x_i and its complement $1 - x_i$.

formly random number $y = y_1 \dots y_{\log_2 H} \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$ and sends it to the seller. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \log_2 H\}$, the seller calculates $z_i = x_i + y_i \bmod 2$. Note that as long as either the seller or the buyer indeed drew their number uniformly at random, the number $z = z_1 \dots z_{\log_2 H}$ is distributed uniformly in $\{0, \dots, H-1\}$. Therefore, having the buyer pay H if $z < s$, and 0 otherwise, results in the required distribution. It remains for the seller to prove to the buyer whether or not $z < s$. Note that a commitment to the bits of z is in fact commonly known: for each i , the commitment to z_i is R_i if $y_i = 0$ and R'_i if $y_i = 1$. Since commitments to both z and s are known, the seller can use methods from the previous examples to prove to the buyer that $z < s$ (or alternatively, that $z \geq s$) without revealing any additional information.

We note that, similarly to before, this method is completely general for any way of describing (single- or multi-buyer) randomized mechanisms using bits: it allows our general techniques from Illustrative Example 3 not only to calculate any function of both public bits and committed bits, but furthermore allows functions that also depend random bits.²⁷ In particular, no additional techniques are needed to implement the mechanism described in Illustrative Example 3 so that the buyer only sees the realized outcome, e.g., if the buyer gets the item, then she never knows whether she paid s^1 (and got the item due to a lucky draw) or paid $s^1 + s^2$ (and had probability 1 of getting the item). Our technique allows even further generality, though. Indeed, not only can we use these techniques with any binary way of describing (single- or multi-buyer) mechanisms to prove IR and IC (or any other property), to calculate the outcome probabilities, and then use the techniques from this example to flip coins with these probabilities to determine any part of the outcome, but we can even allow correlation between lotteries (e.g., for the allocation probabilities to different buyers).

2.4.1 Adding Noise to Prices

In the example just given, the precise price s is hidden even when the item is sold, by replacing it with a randomized payment drawn from a distribution that preserves the expected payment, and hence (assuming risk neutrality) the incentives. One way to view this is as adding zero-mean “noise” to the price s .

Independent work by Eilat et al. (2023) studies how to use randomization to keep a buyer’s type secret from a third party observer of the auction. Broadly speaking, while our paper asks how to implement mechanisms absent a mediator so that nothing is learned by the buyers (or by any observer of all messages) beyond what is learned from only the realized outcome, that paper asks how to minimize the information learned only from the

²⁷With multiple buyers, each buyer j draws a uniformly random sequence z^j of bits, which are then bitwise-summed modulo 2 to obtain a sequence z that is used to shuffle the seller’s commitment to a random sequence of bits as in the example above. As long as at least one agent, buyer or seller, draws her sequence uniformly at random, then the resulting shuffled commitment is to a uniformly random sequence of bits.

realized outcome. While there are various differences—such as that the information we seek to hide is private to the seller and the information that paper seek to hide is private to the buyer—the high-level approaches are fully complementary in the sense that combining both of them would yield a non-mediated mechanism such that an observer viewing all messages between the seller and buyer would learn no more than from a minimally informative mediated mechanism. Concretely, Eilat et al. (2023) characterize, in a single-item auction setting, the randomized mechanism that minimizes the privacy loss of the winning player (rather than mechanism designer) as having starkly similar structure to the one we use in Illustrative Example 4 (also randomizing between 0 and an upper-bound value while maintaining the expected price), which might suggest that the latter might in fact turn out be similarly optimal w.r.t. the mechanism designer’s privacy.

A possible issue is that while the noise in the example indeed has zero mean (guaranteeing that incentives remain), its magnitude, (e.g., its variance) is large, which might be unappealing for certain applications. There is, indeed, a tradeoff between the magnitude of noise and how much is revealed about the price, and one might optimize over this tradeoff by seeking other distributions with the same expected payment but with smaller magnitude corresponding to smaller “noise.”

Differential privacy is a discipline that seeks to prevent information about individuals from leaking from statistical information (Dwork et al., 2006, now used by both Apple and Google, as well as the 2020 US Census, as a privacy tool). A central theme in this literature is the study of the privacy guarantees of adding noise to statistical information. When the information is discrete, of particular usefulness is adding discrete noise given by a two sided geometric distribution²⁸ $Pr[Noise = z] = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha} \alpha^{|z|}$ where $\alpha = 1 - \varepsilon$ for some small $\varepsilon > 0$, and then truncating at 0 and at some maximum value. Adding such noise guarantees that whether this noise is added to an underlying price s or to $s+1$, the probability of each distinct realized payment is the same up to a factor of $1 - \varepsilon$. Hence, the ratio between the posteriors for s and $s+1$ changes only slightly, by at most a factor of $1 - \varepsilon$, which might be desirable. More generally, if such noise is added to a value x or to $x+\ell$, the probabilities of each value in the resulting distributions are the same up to a factor of $(1 - \varepsilon)^\ell$.

²⁸We avoid the often-used term “Geometric mechanism” to ensure no confusion with economic mechanisms. Adding noise from the geometric distribution has important desirable properties. In particular, adding such noise provides optimal oblivious differential privacy for arbitrary loss functions (not only variance), see Ghosh et al. (2012) for definitions and full details.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Standard Definitions

Players, types, outcomes, and utilities There are finitely many *players* $i = 1, \dots, n$. Each player i has a private *type* t_i from a finite set T_i of possible types. There is a finite set X of possible (deterministic) *outcomes* (these include payments, if applicable). Each player i has a *utility function* $u_i: T_i \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $u_i(t_i, x)$ is the utility of player i with (private) type t_i from outcome x .

Example 3.1. In an n -bidder m -item auction setting, we can choose the outcome set as $X = \{y \in \{0,1\}^{n \times m} \mid \forall j = 1, \dots, m: \sum_{i=1}^n y_{ij} \leq 1\} \times \{0, \dots, H\}^n$. An outcome $x \in X$ can then be interpreted as a binary allocation matrix y_{ij} (of dimensions $n \times m$) and a real cost vector c_1, \dots, c_n . If $y_{ij} = 1$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, then bidder i gets item j . Each bidder i pays c_i . Note that by construction, no item may be allocated more than once but some items may remain unallocated. Taking each type set to be $T_i = \{0, \dots, H\}^m$, indicating a value for each item, the utility function of each player i can then be taken as i 's value of items to i allocated minus i 's cost.

Mechanisms and incentives We denote $T = \times_{i=1}^n T_i$. A (*direct-revelation*) *mechanism* M is a function $M: T \rightarrow \Delta(X)$. A mechanism M is *IR* (*Individually Rational*) if $u_i(t_i, M(t)) \geq 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $t \in T$. A mechanism M is *DSIC* (*Dominant Strategy Incentive Compatible*) if for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, $t \in T$, and $t'_i \in T_i$, it is the case that $\mathbb{E}[u_i(t_i, M(t))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u_i(t_i, M(t'_i, t_{-i}))]$, where the type profile (t'_i, t_{-i}) denotes, per standard notation, the type profile derived from the type profile t by replacing player i 's type to be t'_i instead of t_i , and where the expectations are over the randomness of the mechanism.

It will be convenient to view a randomized mechanism $M: T \rightarrow \Delta(X)$ as a *deterministic* function $M: T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X$ where the second input to M is a random sequence of n_r *run bits* drawn uniformly from $\{0,1\}^{n_r}$ for a suitable n_r .^{29,30} Hereinafter we will always describe a randomized mechanism in this way.

Example 3.2. In a setting with two bidders and one item, with $X = \{0,1\}^2 \times \{0, \dots, H\}^2$

²⁹In practice, any algorithmic implementation of a randomized algorithm always uses only finitely many bits of randomness.

³⁰Of course, there are many different ways to map sequences of n_r random bits to outcomes in the support of the outcome distribution of the mechanism. Indeed, taking a function $M: T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X$ and applying to its second input any bijection of $\{0,1\}^{n_r}$ onto itself results in a different function $M': T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X$ that nonetheless represents the same randomized mechanism (when viewed as a function $M: T \rightarrow \Delta(X)$). This fact is important since we will want knowledge of $t \in T$, of $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r}$, and of the outcome $x = M(t, \rho_r)$ to not leak any information about the *distribution* $F = M(t) \in \Delta(X)$ beyond the fact that x is in the support of F . We return to this point later.

and $T_1 = T_2 = \{0, \dots, H\}$ as in Example 3.1. A second price auction with no reserve price and random tie-breaking is the following randomized mechanism:

$$M(t_1, t_2) = \begin{cases} (1, 0, t_2, 0) & t_1 > t_2, \\ (0, 1, 0, t_1) & t_2 > t_1, \\ \text{each of the above with probability } 0.5 & t_2 = t_1. \end{cases}$$

This mechanism, when viewed as a deterministic function taking a random sequence of run bits as an additional input, becomes (it suffices to take $n_r = 1$):

$$M(t_1, t_2, \rho_r) = \begin{cases} (1, 0, t_2, 0) & t_1 > t_2 \text{ or both } t_1 = t_2 \text{ and (the first bit of) } \rho_r \text{ is } 0, \\ (0, 1, 0, t_1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3.2 Languages for Mechanisms and Proofs

Mechanism-Description Languages and Mechanism Interpreters To facilitate the ability of mechanism designers to describe their mechanisms to players, one needs to agree on a way to unambiguously represent mechanisms, to which we refer as a *mechanism-description language*. Depending on the richness of the family of mechanisms that the designer might wish to be able to describe, the mechanism-description language might be more or less complex. It is convenient to focus on a mechanism-description language that represents every mechanism of interest as a finite sequence of bits.

Example 3.3. There is a wide range of mechanism-description languages that facilitate running a mechanism on type profiles, for example:

- The Python programming language is a very general mechanism-description language. In this mechanism-description language, a specific mechanism is represented by a Python function that takes the player types and run bits as inputs, and outputs the outcome.
- If one is interested in describing only mechanisms of a specific functional form, then the mechanism-description language can be more specific. For example, a language used to describe second-price auctions with a reserve price can represent a specific such auction using the reserve price (written out in base 2).
- More generally, a mechanism-description language for a parametrized family of mechanisms can describe each mechanism using its parametrization. E.g., we might describe each of the mechanisms from Illustrative Example 3 in Section 2.3 using the two prices s^1 and s^2 (each written out in base 2 using the same number of digits).

We formalize the notion of a mechanism-description language by specifying how the language is interpreted. A (*mechanism*) *interpreter* (for a specific mechanism-description language) is a function $I : \{0,1\}^* \times T \times \{0,1\}^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X \cup \{\text{“error”}\}$, where we adopt the computer-science notation $\{0,1\}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{\{0,1\}^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denoting the set of all finite sequence of bits.³¹ The four inputs of a mechanism interpreter I are: (1) a *mechanism description* $A \in \{0,1\}^*$ (in the language corresponding to the interpreter), (2) a type profile $t \in T$, (3) a sequence of run bits $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^*$ (treated as random bits as described in Section 3.1), and, (4) a maximum *running time* $R \in \mathbb{N}$. The output $I(A, t, \rho_r, R)$ of an interpreter is an outcome—the outcome of running the mechanism described by A over type profile t with run bits ρ_r , as long as this takes no more than R running time³²—or, possibly, the indication of an error if either the mechanism description A is not valid, not enough run bits are specified, or the maximum running time is exceeded.

Example 3.4. The mechanism-description languages given in Example 3.3 might be formalized by the following interpreters:

- A mechanism interpreter for the Python-based mechanism description language from Example 3.3 indicates (returns) an error if either A is not a valid Python program, it crashes, it does not complete running after R lines of code were executed,³³ or not enough run bits for A are given in ρ_r . Otherwise, it returns the outcome.
- A mechanism interpreter for the mechanism-description language for second-price auctions with a reserve price from Example 3.3 ignores the run bits, outputs the outcome of the auction, and never indicates an error.
- A mechanism interpreter for the third mechanism-description language from Example 3.3 uses a single run bit for randomness, i.e., if $s^1 \leq t/2 < s^2$, then the outcome is $(0, s^1)$ if the run bit is 0, and $(1, s^1)$ if the run bit is 1. The interpreter indicates an error if A does not consist of an even number of bits or the sequence of run bits ρ_r has length 0.

For the remainder of this paper, we will fix some specific mechanism interpreter I (and associated mechanism-description language). For concreteness, one may have in mind any interpreter from Example 3.4. For any valid description A of a mechanism that runs in time $\leq R$ and requires $\leq n_r$ run bits,³⁴ let M_A denote the mechanism described by A (as interpreted

³¹The notation is sometimes called the “Kleene star.”

³²Assuming an abstract objective way to measure the running time of a specific mechanism description with given types and run bits suffices for this paper, and saves us from defining notions from the theory of programming languages such as “execution models.”

³³For readers with familiarity with the inner workings of Python: after R CPython bytecode instructions were executed.

³⁴These notions of validity and running time are dependent upon the interpreter I (and the mechanism-description language that I implicitly defines): what format of input it accepts and considers valid, and how many steps it needs to run A .

by I), i.e., $M_A(t, \rho_r) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I(A, t, \rho_r, R)$ (where $\rho_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r}$). We note that $I(A, t, \rho_r, R)$ indicates no error by the assumption that A is valid, requires $\leq n_r$ run bits, and has running time $\leq R$.

Formal Proof Language We assume a common language in which we can unambiguously state and prove claims. In particular, we assume the ability to formally state and prove claims of the forms “ A is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and has running time at most R ” and “ A , when run on type profile t using run bits ρ_r , has outcome x .”

For concreteness, one could consider using first-order predicate logic (see, e.g., Gonczarowski and Nisan, 2022) as the formal proof language. For ease of exposition, we will not explicitly construct statements and proofs in this logic, however all claims we require in this paper can be written in this logic. Moreover, any claim and any proof that a reader not familiar with this logic has ever seen in any textbook can be written in this logic, and their length in the language of this logic will be comparable to their length in that textbook. We will not need any further details for the purposes of this paper. For an example of a formal proof of the incentive properties of a mechanism, see, e.g., Barthe et al. (2016).

3.3 The Traditional Protocol

Mechanism interpreters help ground the abstract mathematical notion of a mechanism within a computational framework by defining notions such as the mechanism description and its running time. Interpreters do not, however, define the interaction between the different parties when the mechanism is run in real-life. We use the word *protocol* for an interactive process (similar to an extensive-form game) involving a mechanism designer and one or more players.

It will be convenient to formalize what one would traditionally call “committing to a mechanism and then running it,” as the following protocol, to which we refer as the *traditional commit-and-run protocol*. This protocol is parametrized by a nonnegative number n_r , denoting an upper bound on the number of run bits needed to run any mechanism that we may wish to use in this protocol. (Setting $n_r = 0$ restricts to deterministic mechanisms.)

1. Commitment step: the mechanism designer publicly declares a description of a mechanism (that requires at most n_r run bits). as well as a proof that the mechanism described is IR and DSIC. Each player can check the proof to ascertain its validity.
2. Direct revelation step: each player publicly reveals her type.
3. Run randomness generation step: nature draws a uniformly random sequence of n_r bits (e.g., via publicly visible coin tossing) and publicly announces it.
4. Run step: the mechanism designer publicly declares the realized outcome of the mechanism. Each player can check that the outcome really is the output of the mechanism

described in step 1 when run with the announced run bits on the declared types.

A few comments are in order. This protocol is a *direct-revelation* protocol, i.e., the only action required by players in this protocol is to (simultaneously) reveal their types (after they are assured that an IR and DSIC mechanism was fixed). We explicitly model the mechanism designer as providing a formal proof that the mechanism is IR and DSIC as part of the commitment step. This will be convenient later and we note that while this may seem redundant for some mechanisms whose strategyproofness may seem self-explanatory, it is certainly without loss of generality for the mechanism designer to provide a proof even in such cases. Additionally, throughout this paper we focus on IR and DSIC as the properties of interest of a mechanism, however it is straightforward to replace them with alternative notions such as interim IR and BIC with respect to a commonly known distribution, or alternatively group strategyproofness, and/or augment them with additional properties such as fairness and stability.

3.4 A Mechanism-Hiding Mediated Protocol

In the traditional protocol from Section 3.3, the mechanism ends up being known to all players, which in turn drives the commitment, the proof of mechanism properties, and the verification of properly running the mechanism. Our goal in this paper is to construct protocols in which the players are assured of mechanism properties (as noted, our running example for properties is IR and DSIC, but our construction supports arbitrary properties) and of the fact that the mechanism was properly run, and yet do not learn anything about the mechanism beyond what is learned from the outcome. To define this desideratum precisely, we first formalize the trusted-party solution discussed in the beginning of the introduction. In this protocol, commitment, proof of mechanism properties, and verification of properly running the mechanism are all achieved through a discreet (rightfully) trusted third party rather than through inspection of public announcements as in the above traditional protocol.

We refer to the following protocol as the *mediated* (direct-revelation) commit-and-run protocol. This protocol indeed makes the (strong) assumption of a discreet trusted and trustworthy third party. As with the traditional protocol, this protocol is also parametrized by a nonnegative upper bound n_r on the number of run bits needed to run a mechanism.

- 1a. Commitment step: the mechanism designer (discreetly) provides the third party with a mechanism description A (that requires at most n_r run bits) as well as a proof that the mechanism M_A described by A is IR and DSIC.
- 1b. Commitment verification step:³⁵ the trusted third party inspects the provided proof, and publicly declares whether it is valid. As the third party is (rightfully) trusted, if

³⁵The commitment step and commitment verification step of this protocol together perform the function of the commitment step in the above traditional protocol.

she declares the proof valid, then every player is certain of its validity.

2. Direct revelation step: each player publicly reveals her type. Let t be the profile of revealed types.
3. Run randomness generation step: nature draws a uniformly random sequence ρ_r of n_r bits³⁶ and publicly announces it.
- 4a. Run step: the mechanism designer, given t and ρ_r , publicly declares an outcome x as the outcome of the mechanism.
- 4b. Run verification step:³⁷ the trusted third party runs $M_A(t, \rho_r)$ and publicly declares whether its outcome is the same as the outcome x declared by the mechanism designer. As the third party is (rightfully) trusted, if she declares the outcome correct, then every player is certain of its correctness.
5. Post-run: the trusted third party never reveals anything about the mechanism or proof provided to it.

Unlike in traditional protocols, in the above protocol the players learn nothing about the mechanism beyond what is learned from the outcome, and yet are still assured of the mechanism properties (IR and DSIC) and of the mechanism having been properly run.³⁸ As noted above, our goal in this paper is to construct a protocol with the same guarantees as the mediated protocol, but in the absence of any trusted third party. In fact, our privacy guarantee (for the protocols given in the next section) will be that the players learn no more than they would have learned in the above protocol.

4 Mechanism Hiding via Zero-Knowledge Proofs

Our goal is to construct protocols that perform a similar function to the mediated protocol from Section 3.4, however do not require a trusted mediator. We precisely formulate the

³⁶Once again, this can be done using publicly visible coin tossing.

³⁷The run step and run verification step of this protocol together perform the function of the run step in the above traditional protocol.

³⁸Generally, one may wonder whether the players might learn anything about the hidden mechanism from the fact that the run bits ρ_r are public, and possibly wish to keep the run bits private to the mechanism designer, while at the same time guaranteeing that they were properly drawn at random. We note that we keep ρ_r public for simplicity, but that such a guarantee can be implemented within our framework without any additional assumption. Indeed, one way to achieve this is for the mechanism designer to include n_r private bits (which it is in her own interest to draw at random) as part of the mechanism description to which she commits. Subsequently, n_r public bits would be drawn at random as in the mediated protocol above. The mechanism would XOR these public bits with the n_r private bits to form the bits used as randomness for the “actual” mechanism (see Footnote 30 regarding why this does not change the underlying mechanisms). The resulting bits are guaranteed to be random (by the randomness of the public bits) but guaranteed to be private to the mechanism designer as long as the private bits that she included with the mechanism description have been randomly drawn. In fact, in this setting, if there is only a single player then one could even allow the player to choose the bits ρ_r herself, as it would be in her best interest to do so uniformly at random.

generic notion of a protocol in Section 4.2 and our desiderata on protocols in Section 4.3. Before we do so, however, we sketch the general construction of our zero-knowledge protocol at a high level in Section 4.1, building upon several tools from modern cryptography. The proof of why a protocol so constructed satisfies our desiderata (and the precise construction of the protocol) is relegated to Appendix D.

4.1 Trusted Commitment to Hidden Mechanism: Overview

Protocol outline Replacing step 1a of the mediated protocol, the mechanism designer in our unmediated protocol sends a message D_c to the players. This message consists of two parts. The first part is a *cryptographic commitment* to a mechanism description—loosely speaking, this can be thought of as an encrypted version, c , of some mechanism description, which the players cannot decrypt and which the mechanism designer knows how to decrypt only in a single way. This fixes the mechanism despite the mechanism not being explicitly declared to anyone by the mechanism designer. The second part of the message in step 1a is a *non-interactive zero-knowledge proof* that the mechanism implicit in c is IR and DSIC (or any other desirable properties)—in a precise sense, this proves that the mechanism just fixed has such desirable properties. This is done without “decrypting” the mechanism or revealing anything else about it. Ascertaining that an IR and DSIC mechanism was fixed, as is the goal of step 1b in the mediated protocol, can now be performed by the player herself (without the need for any third party). She can do so by verifying the validity of the provided zero-knowledge proof, which only requires access to the messages sent so far.

Steps 2 (direct revelation of player types) and 4a (public announcement of the outcome by the mechanism designer) are unchanged from the mediated protocol.³⁹ Replacing the verification step (step 4b) of the mediated protocol, the mechanism designer in our protocol sends a message D_r to the players. This message is a *non-interactive zero-knowledge proof*, this time that the declared outcome is the result of running the mechanism implicitly fixed in Step 1a on the type reports from Step 2. Similarly, in a precise sense, this proves that the mechanism implicit in c was properly run—again, without “decrypting” the mechanism or revealing anything else about it. Ascertaining that the mechanism was run properly, as is the goal of step 4b in the mediated protocol, can now again be performed by the player herself (without the need for any third party). She can do so by verifying the validity of the provided zero-knowledge proof, which once again only requires access to the messages sent so far.

Finally, the effect of step 5 (the mediator never revealing anything about the mechanism in the future) is achieved by the fact that the mechanism is never disclosed to anyone, and by

³⁹In our analysis we also keep step 3 unchanged (i.e., as a stylized “nature draws a random sequence and publicly announces it”), however see “Obtaining random bits” at the end of Section 4.2 for various, cryptographic and non-cryptographic, ways to practically implement this step.

all information communicated beyond the final outcome being in the form of cryptographic commitments and zero-knowledge proofs.

Cryptographic guarantees Unfortunately, as is virtually always the case in modern cryptography, no perfectly secure solutions to our problem can possibly exist. To see this, notice that for example, if a supposed cryptographic commitment truly uniquely identifies a mechanism, then a malicious adversary/attacker with exceedingly high computational power can exhaustively enumerate over all possible mechanisms and over all possible “secret keys” (or more formally, random choices made by the mechanism designer when constructing the commitment) until they find a combination of mechanism and secret key that is consistent with this commitment. And, even absent such high computational power, an adversary can theoretically guess the correct mechanism and “secret key” with some non-zero, yet extremely small, probability.

That said, modern cryptography can many times pave the way to providing security against *resource-bounded adversaries*: adversaries whose computational resources may be significant, but not unreasonably high. Specifically, such a guarantee would be that the probability that any such adversary break the security is very small.⁴⁰ Of course, a protocol guaranteeing security against adversaries with more resources or with higher probability would require more resources from non-adversarial agents (“well behaved” designer/players). However, for a good cryptographic scheme the latter resources should be considerably lower than those of the adversary against whom security is guaranteed.

To make these two imperfections, which are also shared by our framework, explicit, in this paper we make the desired bounds on the adversarial computational resources (running time) and attack-success probability explicit parameters to our protocols and cryptographic schemes.⁴¹ (The resources required from non-adversarial agents to run the protocol are then also a function of these bounds.)

Finally, given the state of knowledge in computational complexity theory, cryptographic schemes can be proven secure only under the *assumed* infeasibility of solving some computational problems, such as factoring large numbers. Taken together, state-of-the-art cryptographic guarantees are equivalent to guarantees of the general form “if an adversary with

⁴⁰The sought-after guarantee is technically somewhat more nuanced, guaranteeing that the adversary not get *any* nonnegligible “edge”: Not only should it not be possible for the adversary to completely break the security with greater than negligible probability (i.e., beyond what can be attempted by simply guessing secret keys), but it should also not be possible for the adversary to partially break the security to obtain any nonnegligible “edge.”

⁴¹In doing so, we depart from the standard cryptographic literature, which usually makes these two parameters implicit through a single parameter called the *security parameter* of the protocol. This departure from standard cryptographic conventions is geared toward increasing usability to readers who are not experts in cryptographic theory without jeopardizing the underlying mathematical soundness.

computational resources that are not unreasonably high can successfully circumvent the security of the protocol with greater than negligible probability, then such an adversary can also feasibly solve problems like X (e.g., factoring large numbers).” For example, whenever you use your web browser to securely (as indicated by the browser lock sign) connect to your bank, the security of your connection guarantees privacy only with high probability, only against adversaries who do not possess exceedingly high computational resources, and only assuming that they do not know how to feasibly factor large numbers and/or feasibly calculate a discrete logarithm modulo a very large number.

Our results will therefore have the following form. We will have a family of protocols—one for every desired running-time bound B for the adversary and every desired maximum attack-success probability $\varepsilon > 0$ of the adversary. Our formal guarantees of hiding and committing for each such protocol will be that if an adversary with running time at most B succeeds in circumventing the security of the protocol with probability greater than ε (or succeeds in getting any other “edge” greater than ε), then the strategy of such an adversary can be directly used to refute a “standard computational infeasibility assumption,” that is, to solve an entire class of well studied computational problems significantly faster than expert cryptographers and complexity theorists believe to be possible (and, more concretely, to be able to use this to break into virtually any bank account in the world). The resources required by “well behaved” mechanism designer and players to run the protocol as specified (without malice) will be significantly and qualitatively lower than the adversary running time bound (B), and grow very slowly as the adversary’s attack-success probability (ε) shrinks.

4.2 Formal Definition: Commit-and-Run Protocols

We now define a general parametrized class of direct-revelation commit-and-run protocols without any third party (trusted or otherwise). Our main result will be that a suitable choice of such a protocol has the desirable properties of the mediated protocol from Section 3.4, despite the absence of a trusted third party. In this section, we focus on defining the mechanics of running such protocols; we postpone the discussion of the semantic meaning of the various parts of the protocol to the next section, in which we formalize the desiderata from our protocols.

Specifications Each of our “zero knowledge” protocols is parametrized by (1) an upper bound $L_a \in \mathbb{N}$ on mechanism description lengths, (2) an upper bound $n_r \in \mathbb{N}$ on the number of run bits required by mechanisms, (3) an upper bound $R \in \mathbb{N}$ on mechanism running times, and (4) an upper bound $L_p \in \mathbb{N}$ on lengths of proofs that a description is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R . As discussed in Section 4.1, each of our protocols is also parametrized by an upper bound

$B \in \mathbb{N}$ on the running time of an *adversary* (mechanism designer who attempts to break her commitment, or players attempting to discover a secret mechanism) and by a required upper bound $\varepsilon > 0$ on the attack-success probability of any adversary. (The precise meaning of B and ε is defined in Section 4.3.)

Overall, we call a sextuplet $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon)$ of such parameters a *specification*, and denote the family of all possible specifications by Σ . Our main result is that a “zero knowledge” protocol can be constructed for every such specification σ .

Protocols A (commit-and-run direct-revelation) protocol consists of two parts: the grammar rules define the extensive-form interaction, including the order in which messages are sent, the length of each message, and the public-verifiable required relation of messages to each other; the playbook consists of a “recommended behavior” for the mechanism designer. We now define each of these two parts.⁴²

Grammar rules A protocol with *grammar rules* $n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r$ (defined below; see also Table 1) proceeds in the following stages:

0. Commitment randomness generation step: nature draws a uniformly random sequence $\rho_c \in \{0,1\}^{n_c}$ (the number of bits n_c is part of the grammar rules) and publicly announces it.
- 1a. Commitment step: the mechanism designer, given ρ_c , chooses a commitment message $D_c \in \{0,1\}^{L_c}$ (the number of bits L_c is part of the grammar rules) and publicly announces it.
- 1b. Commitment verification step: each of the players may evaluate $\psi_c(\rho_c, D_c) \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ (the predicate ψ_c is part of the grammar rules) to verify that it holds (returns True). Below, we describe grammar rules so that if $\psi_c(\rho_c, D_c)$ holds then the players are convinced that the mechanism designer has committed to a description A of an IR and DSIC mechanism, despite knowing nothing more about the mechanism than in the mediated protocol.⁴³
2. Direct revelation step: each player publicly reveals her type. Let t be the profile of revealed types.
3. Run randomness generation step: nature draws a uniformly random sequence ρ_r of n_r bits (the nonnegative number n_r is part of the grammar rules) and publicly an-

⁴²In presenting a protocol using these two components, we deviate from the standard computer-science view of protocols in favor of greater usability for economists. Indeed, computer-science usually views a protocol as a set of instructions for each participant, where the instructions contain both what the participant is expected to send at any given moment (what we call the playbook) and which test to run on anything received (which implicitly defines what we call the grammar rules).

⁴³Here and below, we avoid a pun regarding the “grammar police” catching the mechanism designer otherwise.

Notation	Meaning
<u>Setting</u>	
n	# of players
X	possible outcomes
T	possible type profiles
$M: T \rightarrow \Delta(X)$ / $M: T \times \underbrace{\{0,1\}^{n_r}}_{\text{i.i.d.}} \rightarrow X$	direct-revelation mechanism (intrinsic/externally given randomness)
<u>Mechanisms and Proofs</u>	
A	mechanism description
$\mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R}$	descriptions of length $\leq L_a$ of mechanisms requiring $\leq n_r$ run bits and with running time $\leq R$
M_A	mechanism defined by description A
P	proof
\mathcal{P}_{L_p}	proofs of length at most L_p
<u>Specifications</u>	
L_a	bound on description lengths
n_r	bound on # of run bits
R	bound on mechanism running time
L_p	bound on proof lengths
B	bound on adversary running time
ε	bound on adversary success probability
$\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$	specification
<u>Protocol Grammar Rules</u>	
n_c	# of (common) commitment random bits
L_c	length in bits of commitment messages
$\psi_c: \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$	commitment verifier
n_r	# of (common) run bits
L_r	length in bits of run messages
$\psi_r: \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \times X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r} \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$	run verifier
<u>Running a Protocol</u>	
$\rho_c \in \{0,1\}^{n_c}$	(common) commitment random bits
$D_c \in \{0,1\}^{L_c}$	commitment message (mnemonic for <i>Declaration</i>)
n_d	# of mechanism-designer private random bits
$\rho_d \in \{0,1\}^{n_d}$	mechanism-designer private random bits
$S_c: \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{L_c}$	mechanism designer commitment strategy
$\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r}$	(common) run bits
$D_r \in \{0,1\}^{L_r}$	run message
$S_r: \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r}$	mechanism designer run strategy
<u>Playbooks</u>	
$\hat{S}_c: \mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R} \times \mathcal{P}_{L_p} \times \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{L_c}$	commitment playbook (recommended commitment strategy for well behaved mechanism designer)
$\hat{S}_r: \mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R} \times \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r}$	run playbook (recommended run strategy for well behaved mechanism designer)
<u>Protocols</u>	
$((n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r), (\hat{S}_c, \hat{S}_r))$	protocol (grammar rules and playbook)
$((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$	protocol catalog (protocol for each specification)

Table 1: Notation for direct-revelation commit-and-run protocols.

nounces it.

- 4a. Run step: the mechanism designer, given t and ρ_r , publicly announces an outcome x as the outcome of the mechanism, and also chooses a run message $D_r \in \{0,1\}^{L_r}$ (the number of bits L_r is part of the grammar rules) and publicly announces it.
- 4b. Run verification step: each of the players may evaluate $\psi_r(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r) \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ (the predicate ψ_r is part of the grammar rules) to verify that it holds. Below, we describe grammar rules so that if $\psi_r(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ holds then the players are convinced that $x = M_A(t, \rho_r)$ where A is the mechanism fixed in step 1a (as verified in step 1b), despite knowing nothing more about the mechanism than in the mediated protocol.

A *commitment strategy* is a function $S_c : \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{L_c}$ from a mechanism designer's private random bits ρ_d (capturing the randomness of the strategy) and the public bits ρ_c from step 0 to a commitment message D_c . (n_d is the number of private random bits the mechanism designer uses.) A *run strategy* is a function $S_r : \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r}$ from ρ_d , ρ_c , the commitment message D_c from step 1a, the type profile t from step 2, and the run bits ρ_r from step 3, to an outcome x and a run message D_r . A *mechanism designer strategy* is a pair (S_c, S_r) of commitment and run strategies.

Playbooks Given a mechanism description, a playbook specifies (recommended) instructions (the *commitment playbook*) for constructing the commitment message and instructions (the *run playbook*) for constructing the run message. We now define these formally. Let $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ be a specification. We write $\mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R}$ for the set of all mechanism descriptions of length at most L_a , using at most n_r run bits, and with running time at most R . We write \mathcal{P}_{L_p} for the set of all proofs of length at most L_p .

A *commitment playbook* is a function $\hat{S}_c : \mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R} \times \mathcal{P}_{L_p} \times \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{L_c}$. Given a mechanism description A and a proof P that A is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R , we think of such a playbook as recommending⁴⁴ that a mechanism designer who wishes to run A use the commitment strategy $\hat{S}_c(A, P, \cdot, \cdot)$ obtained from \hat{S}_c by fixing the first two arguments of the playbook to be A and P . More directly, given A , P , public commitment random bits ρ_c , and the mechanism designer's private random bits ρ_d , the playbook advises the mechanism designer to send the commitment message $\hat{S}_c(A, P, \rho_d, \rho_c)$.

A *run playbook* is a function $\hat{S}_r : \mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R} \times \{0,1\}^{n_d} \times \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \rightarrow X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r}$. Given a mechanism description A , we think of such a playbook as recommend-

⁴⁴One of our guarantees later will be that if a mechanism designer does not effectively follow this recommendation, then the predicate ψ_c will evaluate to **False**, and so this will become known to the players.

ing⁴⁵ that a mechanism designer who wishes to run A use the run strategy $\hat{S}_r(A, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ obtained from \hat{S}_r by fixing its first argument to A . More directly, given A , the mechanism designer's private random bits ρ_d , and all information ρ_c, D_c, t, ρ_r publicly observed up to the run step, the playbook advises the mechanism designer to send the outcome⁴⁶ and run message $\hat{S}_r(A, \rho_d, \rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r)$.

Finally, a *playbook* is a pair (\hat{S}_c, \hat{S}_r) of commitment and run playbooks.⁴⁷ Given a mechanism description A and proof P that A is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R , the playbook recommends the mechanism-designer strategy $(\hat{S}_c(A, P, \cdot, \cdot), \hat{S}_r(A, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$. We call a pair of grammar rules and corresponding playbook a *(direct revelation commit-and-run) protocol*.

Example We remark that the traditional protocol (as defined in Section 3.3) can be simulated using a commit-and-run protocol as defined in this section, as long as we agree in advance not only on an upper bound n_r on the number of run bits used by any mechanism (as we have already done for the traditional and mediated protocols), but also on some upper bound L_a on the length of a mechanism description that we will use and some upper bound L_p on the length of a proof that the mechanism described is IR and DSIC. The relevant grammar rules (which depends on both L_a and L_p) are:

1. $n_c = 0, L_r = 0$,
2. $L_c = L_a + L_p$ is the number of bits required to specify a pair of mechanism description of length at most L_a and proof of length at most L_p ,
3. $\psi_c(\rho_c, D_c)$ is **True** if and only if the proof component of D_c is a valid proof that the description component of D_c describes an IR and DSIC mechanism.
4. n_r is as in the traditional protocol,
5. $\psi_r(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ is **True** if and only if x is the outcome of running the description component of D_c on t and ρ_r .

The commitment playbook is $\hat{S}_c(A, P, \rho_d, \rho_c) = (A, P)$ and the run playbook is $\hat{S}_r(A, \rho_d, \rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r) = (A(t, \rho_r), ())$.

This protocol of course, unlike the mediated protocol, does not provide any privacy guarantee regarding the mechanism. (Indeed, the mechanism description is commonly known by the end of the commitment step.) As already noted, our goal is to construct a commit-

⁴⁵Similarly to before, one of our guarantees later will be that if a mechanism designer does not effectively follow this recommendation, then the predicate ψ_r will evaluate to **False**, and so this will become known to the players.

⁴⁶In our playbook this outcome will of course be $M_A(t, \rho_r)$, however we define the playbook as we do because it is convenient for it to specify an entire run strategy rather than only the message part of it.

⁴⁷An object that recommends cryptographic strategies is sometimes called a *compiler* in the cryptographic literature.

and-run protocol that provides the same privacy guarantee as the mediated protocol (but without the need for a trusted third party).

We conclude this section by giving a rough outline of the connection between the overview of Section 4.1 and the formal framework of this section. In the protocols that we construct in Section 4.3, the message D_c is a cryptographic commitment to a mechanism description alongside a zero-knowledge proof that the committed description is of an IR and DSIC mechanism, the predicate ψ_c verifies this zero-knowledge proof, ρ_r is (as before) the randomness for running the mechanism, D_r is a zero-knowledge proof that the output of the committed description (given t and ρ_r) is x , and the predicate ψ_r verifies this zero-knowledge proof.

Finally, ρ_c is required for technical reasons: ρ_c parametrizes the definitions of what a valid commitment and valid zero-knowledge proof are, and thus ensures that the result of any computation that fully depends on the precise details of these two definitions cannot be “hard coded” in advance into the mechanism designer’s strategy (since the mechanism designer’s strategy must be specified before ρ_c is realized). Without ensuring this, the bound B on the running time of the mechanism designer’s strategy would have no bite, as such computations could be done in advance and not be limited by B . Similarly, the fact that any computation (such as computations that lay the ground for attempting to reverse-engineer commitments or zero-knowledge proofs) that depends on the precise details of ρ_c cannot be “hard coded” in advance in players’ strategies equally allows the bound B on the player’s running times to have bite. As one example, if ρ_c represents two elements in a group, as in the commitment scheme presented in Section 2, then having ρ_c not be known in advance prevents any strategy from hard-coding the discrete logarithm of one of the two elements in the base of the other, which would allow the mechanism designer to open any commitment to any value.

While it is not hard to believe that B would not have bite without the existence of ρ_c , it is far from trivial why the existence of ρ_c suffices for all of the guarantees that we will give. This will indeed hinge on key results from cryptographic theory.

The above discussion underlines the fact that no coalition of only some of the parties (let alone a single party) can be trusted to choose ρ_c randomly. Still, as we now discuss, there are a number of ways to obtain a value for ρ_c that is (rightfully) trusted by all agents to have been drawn at random.⁴⁸

Obtaining random bits Random bits are required in several steps of our protocols. Some random bits, such as the mechanism designer random bits ρ_d , are private to a specific agent

⁴⁸A sequences of bits such as ρ_c is sometimes called a *reference string* in the cryptographic literature. Note, however, that some protocols in the cryptographic literature use more structured (i.e., not uniformly distributed) reference strings whose generation involves secret randomness that is never to be disclosed, and thus require more intricate cryptographic tools to generate than plain coin-tossing. While such protocols can in principle be used here as well, we avoid them for ease of exposition and implementation.

and if they are not truly random, this can only harm the agent in question, so there is no need to enforce that such bits are randomly drawn, as the agent is incentivized to do so.

Other random bits, such as the commitment bits ρ_c and the run bits ρ_r , should be publicly known, and any specific party may have an incentive to influence them. There is, therefore, need to enforce that such bits are truly random, namely unbiased and unpredictable. One way to generate such random bits is to use some publicly observable random phenomena, as was done in practice in the “numbers racket” by the Mafia in New York City (Cook, 2014, p. 68),⁴⁹ or as was done to create the first Bitcoin block.⁵⁰ While this solution might be satisfactory for public random bits whose knowledge earlier in the day, before the protocol starts, cannot jeopardize the protocol (such as the commitment random bits ρ_c), a more rapidly changing random phenomenon would be required for random bits that have to be drawn at a very specific time during the run of the protocol (such as the run random bits ρ_r , which should be drawn only after the mechanism designer commits to the mechanism and players report their types).⁵¹

An alternative method of drawing public random bits is using a publicly visible coin flip. However, this requires trust that the tossed coin is unbiased and unpredictable, which may be problematic (even more so if agents are not all physically together). This limitation can be overcome by using *cryptographic coin flipping* (Blum, 1981; Goldreich et al., 1987)—a cryptographic protocol that produces a common random sequence whose distribution cannot be manipulated by any of the agents, and which can even be carried when agents are far apart from each other.⁵²

To sum up, there are a number of practical unmanipulable methods to uniformly draw truly random bits. Abstracting away from any specific method, in our analysis we simply assume the availability of appropriate random bits and model them as being publicly declared by nature.

⁴⁹Specifically, the last three numbers in the published daily balance of the United States Treasury, and the middle three digits of the number of shares traded that day on the New York Stock Exchange, were used as sources of random numbers by the Genovese crime family.

⁵⁰Part of this block was created by applying a hash function to the title of London Times (supposedly unmanipulable by the creator of Bitcoin) on Jan 3, 2009.

⁵¹For a prototype public randomness generator that uses a rapidly changing physical phenomenon, see the NIST Randomness Beacon at <https://beacon.nist.gov/home>.

⁵²These protocols guarantee that either a truly random coin has been drawn, or else a pre-designated agent—in our case, a natural choice would be the mechanism designer—would be commonly known to have cheated. This is in line with our general paradigm that either the run of the protocol provided commitment and properly ran the committed mechanism, or else every player can ascertain that the mechanism designer has cheated (e.g., provided a flawed zero-knowledge proof at any stage).

4.3 Theoretical Guarantees and Main Result

In this section, we define our desiderata for a commit-and-run protocol to be a “replacement” for the mediated protocol, and formally state our main result, on the existence of a protocol satisfying all of these desiderata. We have four such desiderata: we require that the protocol be “implementing,” “committing,” “hiding,” and “feasibly computable.”

4.3.1 Implementing, Committing, and Hiding Protocols

We start by defining what it means for a protocol to be “implementing,” that is, if the mechanism designer follows the playbook, then the outcome of the protocol is the outcome of running the mechanism designer’s mechanism with the players’ inputs, and all verifications succeed.

Definition 4.1 (Implementing Protocol⁵³). A protocol $((n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r), (\hat{S}_c, \hat{S}_r))$ is *implementing* for a specification $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ if for every $A \in \mathcal{A}_{L_a, n_r, R}$ and (valid) proof $P \in \mathcal{P}_{L_p}$ that A is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R , for every mechanism-designer bits $\rho_d \in \{0,1\}^{n_d}$, for every commitment bits $\rho_c \in \{0,1\}^{n_c}$, for every type profile $t \in T$, and for every run bits $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r}$, the following holds (in the protocol $(n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r)$). If the mechanism designer plays the strategy $(\hat{S}_c(A, P, \cdot), \hat{S}_r(A, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$ and the players play t , then both of the following hold:

- Verifications are successful, i.e., both $\psi_c(\rho_c, D_c)$ and $\psi_r(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, (x, D_r))$ hold, for $D_c = \hat{S}_c(A, P, \rho_d, \rho_c)$ and $(x, D_r) = \hat{S}_r(A, \rho_d, \rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r)$.
- The mechanism that was run is M_A , i.e., $x = M_A(t, \rho_r)$, for x as just defined.

Next, we define what it means for a protocol to be “committing,” that is, regardless of whether the mechanism designer follows the playbook or not, either her commitment message gives rise to a single mechanism whose output will be the outcome, or some verification will fail. In a precise sense, despite not publicly declaring this mechanism, successful verifications imply that the mechanism designer has for all intents and purposes committed to it. Notice that due to the timing of interaction in a commit-and-run protocol, nothing prevents the mechanism designer from choosing the mechanism based on the commitment random bits ρ_c (and on her private random bits ρ_d), and this is fine since these bits are realized before the player types are disclosed and do not depend on the types. The following definition says that if all verifications succeed, then the mechanism cannot depend on anything else that the mechanism designer learns during the run of the protocol. The only exception might possibly in case nature draws one of a negligibly small set of ρ_c to which the mechanism

⁵³We emphasize that unlike the standard cryptographic notion of “soundness,” our “implementing” desideratum is not a probabilistic one.

designer strategy might be specifically tailored (e.g., hardcodes discrete logarithms for these ρ_c values / guesses them successfully).

Definition 4.2 (Committing Protocol⁵⁴). A protocol with grammar rules $(n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r)$ is *committing* for a specification $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ if for every mechanism designer strategy (S_c, S_r) computable in time at most B the following holds. For every mechanism-designer bits $\rho_d \in \{0, 1\}^{n_d}$, there exists a set $R_c \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{n_c}$ of measure at least $1 - \varepsilon$ of sequences of commitment bits, such that for every commitment bits $\rho_c \in R_c$ there exists a description A_{ρ_c} of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R , such that: For every type profile $t \in T$ and run bits $\rho_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r}$, if both commitment and run verifications succeed, then the mechanism that was run is $M_{A_{\rho_c}}$. That is, for every $\rho_c \in R_c$, $t \in T$, and $\rho_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r}$, if both $\psi_c(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c))$ and $\psi_r(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r, S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r))$ hold, then it is the case that $S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)_{\text{outcome}} = M_{A_{\rho_c}}(t, \rho_r)$.

Definition 4.2 showcases what we mean in the introduction when we say that we replace a traditional commitment to an observed mechanism via verification of publicly observed signals (mechanism and outcome announcements), with a *self-policing* commitment to a *never-observed mechanism*, yet similarly via verification of publicly observed signals (the messages). This definition says that whatever the mechanism designer strategy is, even if one could examine it and no mechanism would seem to explicitly pop out, then for all but negligibly many initial random sequences ρ_c , the success of the verification of only public messages quite strikingly implies that some IR and DSIC mechanism does in fact implicitly drive the strategy—just like a declaration by the (rightfully) trusted third party in the mediated protocol would. Yet the mechanism, whether explicit or implicit in the mechanism designer strategy, is never observed by anyone (not even a trusted mediator) except the designer—it may well exist solely in her mind.

The two protocol properties defined so far, implementing and committing, hold also in the traditional protocol (committing even holds there in a stronger deterministic sense). We now define a new property that is not present in the traditional protocol. We call this property “hiding,” and it guarantees, regarding computationally bounded players, that with high probability, (1) before they report their type, they learn nothing about the mechanism

⁵⁴One may contrast our “committing” desideratum with the standard cryptographic notion of “efficient extraction,” which, adapted to our setting, would have been required, roughly speaking, the ability to sample in a computationally feasible manner from pairs of random bits and mechanism descriptions such that verifications succeed with high probability. From a cryptographic viewpoint, our proof in Appendix D that our zero-knowledge protocols satisfy the stronger “committing” desideratum provides new motivation for a property of the cryptography underlying our construction that is non-standard in the cryptographic literature: having the real and simulated reference strings be drawn from the same distribution; see Appendix F.

except for whatever is implied by its announced properties until then (IR and DSIC, using at most n_r run bits, running in time at most R , having a proof of length at most L_p of this, and having a description length at most L_c), and, (2) after the protocol concludes, they learn nothing about the mechanism except for whatever is implied by its announced properties until then (all of the above, and in addition what $M(t, \rho_r)$ is).

Definition 4.3 (Hiding Protocol⁵⁵). A protocol $((n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r), (\hat{S}_c, \hat{S}_r))$ is *hiding* for a specification $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ if both of the following (items 1 and 2 below) hold for every distinguisher program \mathcal{D} computable in time at most B , and every $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{L_a, R}$ and proofs $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{L_p}$ such that each P_i is a (valid) proof that A_i is a valid descriptions of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R .

1. (Commitment step is hiding) The following probability when defined with $(A, P) = (A_1, P_1)$ is no more than ε apart than when defined with $(A, P) = (A_2, P_2)$:
 - The probability (over uniformly drawn commitment bits ρ_c and mechanism-designer bits ρ_d) of the distinguisher \mathcal{D} outputting “This is A_1 ” on input (ρ_c, D_c) corresponding to a run of the commitment stage of the protocol where the mechanism designer plays the commitment playbook for A, P , i.e., $\hat{S}_c(A, P, \cdot, \cdot)$.
2. (Run step is hiding) For every type profile $t \in T$ and run bits $\rho_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r}$, if $A_1(t, \rho_r) = A_2(t, \rho_r)$, then the following probability when defined with $(A, P) = (A_1, P_1)$ is no more than ε apart than when defined with $(A, P) = (A_2, P_2)$:
 - The probability (over uniformly drawn commitment bits ρ_c and mechanism-designer bits ρ_d) of the distinguisher \mathcal{D} outputting “This is A_1 ” on input $(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ corresponding to a run of (all stages of) the protocol where the mechanism designer plays the playbook for A, P , i.e., $(\hat{S}_c(A, P, \cdot, \cdot), \hat{S}_r(A, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$.

While Definition 4.3 provides good secrecy guarantees in many scenarios, one limitation of it is that it considers fixed mechanisms (and proofs). That is, it is silent on whether a mechanism that is chosen in a way that depends on the commitment bits ρ_c is hidden or not. One might think that this is only hypothetical: Why should the mechanism designer ever wish to choose the mechanism based on ρ_c ? One could nonetheless imagine scenarios in which one might be forced to do that. Imagine implementing the generation of ρ_c by applying a hash function to the title of a leading newspaper as discussed in Footnote 50, and imagine that some prices in the committed mechanism depend on the price of some raw

⁵⁵As discussed following Definition 4.3, one may contrast our “hiding” desideratum to the much harder to grasp “strong hiding” that we define in Definition B.1, adapting the standard cryptographic notion of hiding through “simulation.” While cryptography usually shies away from non-simulation-based indistinguishability as in our “hiding,” the usual downfalls of similar approaches are circumvented here due to properties specific to the interactions in our protocols.

material. Can one really claim that the newspaper title is not correlated in any way with this price? (After all, if the title announces a war, the price of certain materials might be more likely to increase.) In such a case, Definition 4.3 is silent about the secrecy of *any part* of the mechanism. Another more subtle issue (which may or may not be of concern to the mechanism designer) is that Definition 4.3 does not rule out the possibility of a player participating in the protocol solely to save on computational power for some other task that she may be trying to achieve. In Appendix B, we define a technically stronger hiding property, which we call *strong hiding* and which circumvents both of these rather exotic limitations. We note that all of our constructions in this paper also satisfy this stronger property. We defer the definition of this property to the appendix due to its relative conceptual and technical complexity, in particular for readers not familiar with the cryptographic notion of *simulation*, upon which it is based. For added strength, whenever we set out to prove in this paper that a protocol that we construct is hiding, we also prove that it is strongly hiding.

4.3.2 Feasibly Computable Protocol Catalogs

Finally, we define what it means for a protocol to be “feasibly computable.” As common in computer science and statistics, this definition captures *asymptotic feasibility*, and to make it explicit, we in fact define what it means for a *family* of commit-and-run protocols to be feasibly computable.⁵⁶ We formalize the notion of a family of commit-and-run protocols as what we call a *commit-and-run protocol catalog*, which we simply define as a protocol for each possible specification. We then extend the definition of implementing (Definition 4.1), committing (Definition 4.2), and hiding (Definition 4.3) protocols onto catalogs.

Definition 4.4 (Commit-and-Run Protocol Catalog). A *commit-and-run protocol catalog* is a family of protocols $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ where for every specification $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ we have that⁵⁷ $n_r^\sigma = n_r$. Such a catalog is . . .

- *implementing* if for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the protocol $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))$ is implementing for σ .

⁵⁶The standard approach in computer science is to define such a family implicitly using “big-O notation,” which with a large number of parameters might be challenging to navigate for readers who are do not regularly encounter it (and even for those who do).

⁵⁷A short discussion on notation is in order here. One can think of a catalog as a machine whose “control panel” can be used to input a specification σ , and which outputs a protocol suitable for use with mechanisms as specified by σ and with guarantees as specified by σ . Under this interpretation, n_r , a component of σ , is a number typed into the control panel, which specifies how many run bits supported mechanisms may need. The value n_r^σ , a component of the protocol corresponding to specification σ , is the number of random bits drawn in Step 3 of that protocol. (There is a semantic difference here: n_r specifies which mechanisms we should be able to support, while n_r^σ specifies how to mechanically run the protocol.) The requirement $n_r^\sigma = n_r$ simply states that these two numbers should be one and the same: Drawing this number of random bits is both sufficient and necessary for running all mechanisms that we have to support.

- *committing* if for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the protocol $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))$ is committing for σ .
- *hiding* if for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the protocol $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))$ is hiding for σ .

We now formally define what it means for such a catalog to be “feasibly computable,” that is, for its message sizes and computational requirements to asymptotically be essentially the same (i.e., the same up to logarithmic or subpolynomial factors, of which we think as small) as in the traditional protocols.

Definition 4.5 (Feasibly Computable Protocol Catalog). We say that $s^\sigma = s^{(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon)} \in \mathbb{N}$ is *essentially linear* in a (parametrized) quantity $C(\sigma)$ if there exists a polylogarithmic⁵⁸ function $\text{polylog}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and a subpolynomial⁵⁹ function $\text{subpoly}(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that $s^\sigma \leq C(\sigma) \cdot \text{polylog}(L_a, R, L_p) \cdot \text{subpoly}(B, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$. (We emphasize that the polylogarithmic function $\text{polylog}()$ and the subpolynomial function $\text{subpoly}()$ must not depend on σ .) If s^σ is essentially linear in 1 (i.e., if it is at most $\text{polylog}(L_a, R, L_p) \cdot \text{subpoly}(B, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$), then we say that it is *essentially constant*.⁶⁰

A commit-and-run protocol catalog $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ is *feasibly computable* if all of the following hold:

- The number of commitment random bits n_c^σ is essentially constant.
- The length L_c^σ of the commitment message and the running times of the commitment verifier ψ_c^σ and commitment playbook \hat{S}_c^σ are essentially linear in $L_a + L_p$.^{61,62}
- The length L_r^σ of the run message and the running times of the run verifier ψ_r^σ and run playbook \hat{S}_r^σ are essentially linear in R .^{63,64}

⁵⁸A function is polylogarithmic if it is at most some polynomial in the logarithms of its parameters.

⁵⁹A function is subpolynomial if it is asymptotically smaller than *any* polynomial in its parameters. E.g., $\log^7 x$ is a subpolynomial function of x , whereas $x^{1/3}$ and $x^{0.000001}$ are *not* subpolynomial in x as both are considered polynomial in x .

⁶⁰The subpolynomial dependence on B and $1/\varepsilon$ in the definitions of essentially linear and essentially constant is a reformulation of the standard notion of cryptographic security, namely that the protocol run in time polynomial in the security parameter, while making sure that an adversary whose computing power is *any* polynomial in the security parameter succeeds with probability negligible in the security parameter. Our formulation starts from the adversary’s computing power and attack-success probability (rather than from the security parameter) as the basic parameters, and hence a requirement that the running time in question be polynomial in the security parameter is equivalently restated as that running time being subpolynomial in these two basic parameters.

⁶¹*Cf.* the traditional protocol, where the commitment message length and the running times in the commitment stage are linear in $L_a + L_p$.

⁶²In fact, while *essentially linear in $L_a + L_p$* implies that the dependence on $L_a + L_p$ (keeping R , B , and ε fixed) is $(L_a + L_p) \cdot \text{polylog}(L_a + L_p)$, the additional polylogarithmic dependence on $L_a + L_p$ is not required here.

⁶³*Cf.* the traditional protocol, where the run message length and the running times in the run stage are linear in R .

⁶⁴As before, while *essentially linear in R* implies that the dependence on R (keeping L_a , L_p , and B , and ε fixed) is $R \cdot \text{polylog}(R)$, the additional polylogarithmic dependence on R is not required here.

- The number of mechanism designer private bits n_d , which is implicitly defined by the playbook $(\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma)$, is essentially linear in $L_a + R + L_p$.

4.3.3 Main Result

We are now finally ready to state our main result: that there exists a commit-and-run protocol catalog that satisfies all of our desiderata, and hence provides the same benefits as the mediated protocol does, yet without the need for any mediator.

Theorem 4.1. *Under standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumptions, there exists a hiding, committing, implementing, and feasibly computable direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol catalog.*

The statement “Under standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumptions”⁶⁵,⁶⁶ in Theorem 4.1 should be interpreted along the lines of the discussion on cryptographic guarantees from Section 4.1: We prove Theorem 4.1 by showing that there exists an implementing and feasibly computable direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol catalog, as well as a family of widely studied computational problems, believed by expert cryptographers and computational theorists to be hard, such that the following holds. Any strategy that is either (1) a mechanism-designer strategy that breaks the committing guarantee, or (2) a distinguisher that breaks the hiding guarantee, can be directly used (in a precise, quantitative sense) to solve these hard problems, which are at the heart of a plethora of cryptographic systems all around the world. This in particular means that any strategy that breaks our hiding or committing guarantees could be directly used to break into virtually any bank account in the world.

We prove Theorem 4.1 in Appendix D following the high-level outline described in Section 4.1 (i.e., the commitment message is a cryptographic commitment to a mechanism description + zero-knowledge proof of properties of this description, and the run message is a zero-knowledge proof of properly running the mechanism), using a cryptographic framework that we formally define in Appendix C. This framework provides a general, flexible “one-stop-shop wrapper” around all of the existing cryptographic tools (and definitions) needed in our proof of Theorem 4.1. We hope that its self-contained definition and fairly low barrier for entry might make this framework appealing also for independent use in other

⁶⁵These assumptions are often referred to as “standard cryptographic assumptions” in the cryptographic literature, and share a similar status to that of the computational assumption of $P \neq NP$ (despite technically being stronger): While they have neither been proven nor disproven, they sustained much scrutiny by mathematicians and computer scientists, and have been the basis for numerous theoretical and practical applications in various fields and industries.

⁶⁶Our construction can be for example based upon any of the four following well-known computational infeasibility assumptions: (1) RSA, (2) LWE (learning with errors), (3) DDH (decisional Diffie–Hellman) and LPN (learning parity with noise), (4) Bilinear DDH. For more details, see Appendix F.

economic theory papers that may wish to avoid the learning curve associated with directly using other cryptographic definitions and tools.

4.3.4 Succinct Communication and Verification

There is a large body of work in both economics and computer science that deals with the communication requirements of mechanisms (Nisan and Segal, 2006; Segal, 2007; Dobzinski, 2016; Gonczarowski, 2018; Gonczarowski et al., 2019b; Rubinstein and Zhao, 2021; Rubinstein et al., 2021; Babaioff et al., 2022). In these papers, the mechanism in question is assumed to be commonly known.

In many real-life settings, however, the mechanism is initially known only to the mechanism designer, who wishes to send it to all players. Absent any *a priori* structure on the mechanism, the description of the mechanism itself may be exponentially longer than the messages that need to be communicated to run the mechanism when it is commonly known to begin with.⁶⁷ This results in qualitatively higher communication already when running the traditional protocol (which communicates the mechanism because it is not commonly known to begin with), and the same high communication is preserved by our construction from Theorem 4.1.

In our setting, however, unlike in the traditional protocol, the mechanism designer does *not* wish to send the mechanism to anyone—quite the contrary, in fact: she wants players to know that the mechanism is IR and DSIC (or any other property of interest that she chooses), but to know nothing more. In this section we ask whether the communication requirements of the traditional protocol can therefore in fact be qualitatively improved upon in our setting. Note that this is not completely implausible: we indeed wish for far less information (in some sense) to be communicated—not an entire mechanism description, but only one binary property thereof. That being said, this argument seems quite problematic, as while what needs to be communicated indeed is only one binary property of the mechanism, we do not merely wish to send it, but furthermore for it to be *verifiable*, and its validity intimately depends upon the output of the mechanism on each and every possible input, i.e., depends on every part of the mechanism description.

Perhaps surprisingly, we give an affirmative answer: we can construct a protocol catalog that satisfies all of the desiderata defined so far, and in addition exponentially improves upon the communication from the traditional protocol, resulting in a communication requirement on par with that of running an *already commonly known* direct-revelation mechanism.

Another key difference between our protocols and the traditional protocol is that in the

⁶⁷For example, Babaioff et al. (2022) show that the deterministic communication complexity of running a commonly known single-player mechanism is precisely the logarithm, base 2, of its menu size (number of options presented to the player). In contrast, spelling out the menu is, of course, at least linear in the menu size.

latter, players verify the outcome by running the mechanism themselves. In our protocols, in contrast, verification must be done by very different means: players cannot run the mechanism themselves because they do not know it. A second question that we therefore ask in this section is whether the computational power required by the players can be qualitatively improved upon compared to the traditional protocol. A priori, this appears completely impossible: How can one verify that the mechanism was properly run, without trusting others, with less work than needed for performing the required calculations on one’s own? Quite strikingly, we give an affirmative answer to this question as well.

We note that it was previously unknown how to achieve such a dramatic reduction in either communication or running time of mechanisms, even when secrecy is not required. Formally, we capture the requirement that the communication size and verification running time be logarithmic in that of the traditional mechanism as follows.

Definition 4.6 (Succinct Protocol Catalog). A direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol catalog $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ is *succinct* if all message lengths and verifier running times are essentially constant⁶⁸, that is:

- The commitment message length L_c^σ and run message length L_r^σ are each essentially constant.
- The maximum running times of the commitment verifier ψ_c^σ and the run verifier ψ_r^σ are each essentially constant.

In a succinct protocol catalog, from the players’ perspective, computation is indeed exponentially faster than in the traditional protocol, in which computation is linear in R —the computation required to run the mechanism.⁶⁹ From the mechanism designer’s perspective, however, the required computation (running the playbook) remains of essentially the same complexity as in the traditional protocol (i.e., the guarantee will remain the same as in Theorem 4.1), which is unavoidable since *someone* has to do the work of running the mechanism.

Theorem 4.2. *In the random oracle model, there exists a hiding, committing, implementing, feasibly computable, and succinct direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol catalog.*

The statement “In the random oracle model” in Theorem 4.2 should be interpreted in a qualitatively similar way to what is discussed after Theorem 4.1: without going into too many details, let us note that a cryptographic scheme that is based on the *random oracle model* can be implemented in the real world based on any hash function that is thought to

⁶⁸Recall that essentially constant means at most $\text{polylog}(L_a, R, L_p) \cdot \text{subpoly}(B, \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

⁶⁹Such a computational guarantee is sometimes called being *doubly (computationally) efficient* in the computer-science literature, analogously to the term “doubly exponential,” which refers to “exponential larger/slower than exponential.”

be secure. Any strategy that breaks our hiding or committing guarantees for such a specific implementation can be directly used to break into prevalent cryptographic systems around the world that are implemented based on the same hash function.

We prove Theorem 4.2 in Appendix D in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 4.1, replacing zero-knowledge proofs with ZK-SNARKs (see, e.g., Bitansky et al., 2017; Groth, 2016; Boneh et al., 2021), which are a succinct and non-interactive form of zero-knowledge proofs, where the work done by the verifier of the proof (and in particular the length of the proof) is only polylogarithmic in the original, plaintext proof and the work needed to verify it.⁷⁰

Our “one-stop-shop” cryptographic framework that we define in Appendix C wraps around either type of cryptographic primitives: sophisticated ones that enable succinctness or simpler ones that do not. This frees us from directly handling and arguing about ZK-SNARKs or any other specific cryptographic component.

4.3.5 Non-Computational Committing/Hiding Guarantees

Two of the four desiderata of our protocols, committing and hiding, condition their guarantees on the computational power available to the adversary (mechanism designer in the case of committing, players+distinguisher in the case of hiding), and give these guarantees with very high probability but not surely. While each of these two desiderata provides well behaved agents that have moderate computational power with very high-probability guarantees against adversaries with exceedingly greater computing power, one may wonder whether the guarantee could be made unconditional w.r.t. the adversary’s computational power (i.e., for “ $B = \infty$ ”⁷¹) or even furthermore certain (i.e., for $\varepsilon = 0$)⁷². It follows from well-known general cryptographic impossibilities that in our setting it would be impossible to strengthen both committing and hiding in this way. However, any one of the two could be strengthened while keeping the other computational; for example, the illustrative examples in Section 2 afford *perfect hiding* while keeping the commitment computational. We have not taken a stand in this section on how to optimally resolve this tradeoff, both because computational guarantees are widely considered strong enough for some of the most sensitive data in the world, and because if one does wish to strengthen one of these desiderata, the choice of which one would be application dependent. Indeed, in settings in which commitment is paramount, far beyond hiding, and any degradation in player incentives is unacceptable, one may wish to opt for *perfect commitment*, while in settings in which hiding is paramount, or should be “future proofed” so that the mechanism used today would be impossible to reveal even into

⁷⁰If one is interested only in succinctness and not in hiding the mechanism, one may turn to a relaxation of ZK-SNARKs called SNARKs, which would result in slightly better running time.

⁷¹Such guarantees are sometimes called *statistical* (rather than computational) in the cryptographic literature.

⁷²Such guarantees are sometimes called *perfect* in the cryptographic literature.

the distant future and even with technologies not yet available today, one may wish to opt for *perfect hiding*.

5 Extensions

5.1 Private Actions and Moral Hazard: Zero-Knowledge Contracts

We have so far considered mechanisms with private types and public actions/reports. It is straightforward to apply our framework also to mechanisms with private actions (and hence moral hazard), such as contracts.⁷³ In a traditional protocol for contracts (i.e., in an equivalent for contracts of the protocol from Section 3.3), the properties to be proven by the mechanism designer (the principal) in the commitment step are individual rationality (and in some settings limited liability) and the value of the optimal level of effort for the player (the agent) to privately exert; furthermore, the direct revelation step is replaced with an actions/returns step in which the agent privately exerts effort, following which the stochastic returns are publicly realized. If these returns are denoted, by abuse of notation, by t , then the remaining steps (calculation of the outcome based upon t and possibly run bits ρ_r) continue exactly as defined in Section 3.3. (Both our formulation and our construction can easily handle mechanisms with both private types *and* private actions.)

A commit-and-run protocol for such contracts is then similar to the one in Section 4.2, with the same changes as just described to the incentive property proven and to the semantic interpretation (and the source of) t in the direct-revelation-turned-actions/returns step. At a high level, the commitment playbook then involves the principal sending to the agent a cryptographic commitment to a hidden contract along with a zero-knowledge proof of the optimal effort for the agent to exert. (In the case of private actions and private types, and possibly even multiple agents, the optimal effort for each agent may be type-dependent. In this case, the proof is that for each type of each agent, she is incentivized to exert this effort, as well as, if the outcome depends on her type also directly, to truthfully reveal her private type.) The run playbook again involves a zero-knowledge proof that the declared outcome is consistent with the hidden contract/mechanism that was committed to in the commitment stage.

⁷³In a nutshell: A principal wants an agent to invest effort to stochastically increase the principal's returns. The level of effort that the agent exerts is private (unobserved and uncontractible), so the principal offers the agent a *contract*: a monetary transfer between the principal and the agent that is a function of the principal's future (stochastic, publicly realized) returns. As we discuss in the introduction, there are natural settings in which it can be of interest for the principal to commit to this function while hiding it and proving that it incentivizes exertion of effort, and having the agent only eventually learn their bottom-line realized wage (or loss, in cases without limited liability).

5.2 Individually Revealing Parts of the Outcome: To Each Their Own

In some settings, each outcome $x \in X$ naturally decomposes into parts that are each relevant to a different player. Given an outcome $x \in X$, let us denote by $\nu_i(x)$ the part of the outcome that we wish for player i to learn, which we will call the *view* of player i of the outcome x . A natural choice for $\nu_i(x)$ might be to have it contain (at least) all of the payoff-relevant information for player i , i.e., if $\nu_i(x) = \nu_i(x')$ for $x, x' \in X$, then i 's utility is the same in x and in x' . For example, in an auction setting, $\nu_i(x)$ could capture the items that i gets and i 's payment. In a matching setting, $\nu_i(x)$ could capture i 's match. In any such setting, we can generalize our definition of commit-and-run protocols from Section 4.2 by reformulating the run step and the run verification step as follows:

- 4a. Run step: the mechanism designer, given t and ρ_r , chooses and privately sends to each player $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ a view $\bar{\nu}_i$ and a run message $D_r^i \in \{0, 1\}^{L_r}$.
- 4b. Run verification step: each player i may evaluate $\psi_r^i(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, \bar{\nu}_i, D_r^i)$ (all of the predicates ψ_r^i are part of the grammar rules) to verify that it holds.

The run playbook appropriately has the mechanism designer send each player their view of the outcome and a run message with a zero-knowledge proof of correctness of the view given t and ρ_r . The committing desideratum from a protocol is then that if $\psi_r^i(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, \bar{\nu}_i, D_r^i)$ holds then player i is convinced beyond any reasonable doubt (i.e., in the sense of Definition 4.2) that $\bar{\nu}_i = \nu_i(M_A(t, \rho_r))$ where A is the mechanism fixed in step 1a (as verified in step 1b).

It is straightforward to generalize all of our definitions and results to this scenario as well. We note that while in the auctions and matching examples just given, $\nu_i(x)$ was player i 's payoff-relevant information about x , in some settings there might be economic benefit in having it also capture further non-payoff-relevant information that we might wish player i to learn. For example, in a matching setting one might wish to publicly announce some statistics about the mechanism performance, such as how many students received their most-preferred institution.⁷⁴ In an auction setting, one may wish to publicly announce whether there was a winner, or how many winners there were. Any of these could be done by including such statistics in the view of each player.⁷⁵

Finally, while this is outside the scope of our paper, we note that various tools in cryptography could be used to tweak this protocol in various additional ways. E.g., by making

⁷⁴This aggregate information is what, e.g., Gonczarowski et al. (2019a) report when comparing their mechanism to alternative implementations.

⁷⁵Alternatively, we might further generalize the definition of a commit-and-run protocol by having the mechanism designer send not only a view (and a corresponding message that could be used to verify this view) to each player, but also publicly announce a public view (and corresponding message that could be used to verify this view).

verification interactive, one could design the protocol such that each player learns her view but is not able to credibly prove to other players that this really is her view. One use of this might be to prevent many players from confidently aggregating their views in order to learn more about the hidden mechanism.

5.3 Hiding Both the Mechanism and the Types

In this section, we discuss how the techniques introduced in this paper can be combined with ideas from previous work to hide both the mechanism from the players *and* the type report of each player from the mechanism designer and from the other players. An illustrative example of such a construction, along the lines of the illustrative examples from Section 2 and using a similar construction, is given in Appendix E. We start with an example that motivates hiding the type reports, not for the sake of the privacy of the players as in previous papers, but rather for the sake of the secrecy *of the mechanism*. (This can be thought of as conceptually similar to how Illustrative Example 4 from Section 2 motivates the use of randomness within mechanisms from a mechanism-secrecy perspective.)

5.3.1 A Motivating Example

Assume that there is a set of possible *unpriced* outcomes Y , such that an outcome $x \in X$ is a tuple $x = (y; s^1, \dots, s^n)$ indicating unpriced outcome y and transfer s^i by each player i . Furthermore assume that each player's utility is linear in her own transfer and not dependent on others' transfers, i.e., for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, every $t_i \in T_i$ is a valuation function $t_i: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $u_i(t_i, x) = t_i(y) - s^i$ for every outcome $x = (y; s^1, \dots, s^n)$.

Let $W = \{(w_1, \dots, w_n) \in (0, 1)^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1\}$, and assume that the mechanism designer wishes to maximize *weighted social welfare* according to some weights $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in W$. That is, the mechanism designer wishes to choose $y \in \arg\max_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i t_i(y)$. One well-known way to set transfers to elicit truthful reports of the valuation functions when choosing y in this way is to use a variant of the Groves mechanism with no pivot rule, i.e., to set the transfer of each player i to be $s^i = -\frac{1}{w_i} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j t_j(y)$ (i.e., i receives $\frac{1}{w_i} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j t_j(y)$). Denote this mechanism by M_w . We claim that if one has access to all of the players' reported types, then unless the reported types t are so degenerate that each player is indifferent between all outcomes (in which case the weights are of no consequence to the outcome, including to any prices), then from the single outcome $M_w(t)$ of the mechanism, one can deduce the entire weight vector w .

Proposition 5.1. *For every $t \in T$, unless $t_i(y) = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $y \in Y$, there exists a function $E_t: X \rightarrow W$ such that $E_t(M_w(t)) = w$ for every $w \in W$.*

Proof. We will show that the following function is well defined (in particular, that none of

the denominators are zero) and satisfies the requirements:

$$E_t(y; s^1, \dots, s^n) = \left(\frac{\frac{1}{s^1 - t_1(y)}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{s^k - t_k(y)}}, \dots, \frac{\frac{1}{s^n - t_n(y)}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{s^k - t_k(y)}} \right).$$

Let $t \in T$ and $w \in W$, and let $(y; s^1, \dots, s^n) = M_w(t)$. Note that for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have that $w_i s^i = -\sum_{j \neq i} w_j t_j(y)$. Therefore, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have that $w_i s^i - w_j s^j = w_i t_i(y) - w_j t_j(y)$, and hence, $w_i (s^i - t_i(y)) = w_j (s^j - t_j(y))$. Therefore, either $s^k - t_k(y) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$, or $s^k - t_k(y) \neq 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$. Assume for contradiction that $s^k - t_k(y) = 0$ for all k , then since $s^k \leq 0$ and $t_k(y) \geq 0$ for all k , we have that $t_k(y) = 0$ (and $s^k = 0$) for all k . Therefore, the weighted social welfare from y is zero, and since y maximizes weighted social welfare, we have that the weighted social welfare from all $y' \in Y$ is zero, contradicting the assumption that it is not the case that $t_k(y') = 0$ for all k and y' . We conclude that $s^k - t_k(y) \neq 0$ for all k .

For every i, j , we therefore have that $\frac{w_i}{w_j} = \frac{s^j - t_j(y)}{s^i - t_i(y)}$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$, we therefore have that $w_i = \frac{\frac{1}{s^i - t_i(y)}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{s^k - t_k(y)}}$ for all i , as claimed. \square

5.3.2 A Report-Hiding Mediated Protocol

As we have now demonstrated, knowing the type reports in addition to the outcome can crucially increase what one can deduce about the mechanism just from a single run of the mechanism. This holds even if the mechanism is realized via our zero-knowledge protocols or via the mediated protocol from Section 3.4. To further protect the mechanism in such situations, one may wish to consider an even more secretive mediated protocol in which even the type reports are never publicly revealed, along the following lines. In this protocol, the third party does not only verify statements by the mechanism designer, but in fact actively draws random bits private to the third party, privately performs calculations, and announces information that is not known to any single agent prior to the announcement:

- 1a. Commitment step (as in Section 3.4): the mechanism designer (discreetly) provides the third party with a mechanism description A (that requires at most n_r run bits). The mechanism designer furthermore (discreetly) provides the third party with a proof that the mechanism M_A described by A is IR and DSIC.
- 1b. Commitment verification step (as in Section 3.4): the trusted third party inspects the provided proof, and publicly declares whether it is valid. As the third party is (rightfully) trusted, if she declares the proof as valid, then every player is certain of its validity.
2. Type-reporting step: each player discreetly provides the third party with her type. Let t be the profile of provided types.

3. Run step: the third party draws a uniformly random sequence ρ_r of n_r bits, calculates $x = M_A(t, \rho_r)$, and publicly declares the outcome x . As the third party is (rightfully) trusted, the mechanism designer, as well as every player, is certain of its correctness.
4. Post-run: the trusted third party never reveals anything about the mechanism, proof, or types provided to it.

In this section, we discuss how such a trusted third party could be replaced with cryptographic tools.

5.3.3 Implementation via Zero-Knowledge Proofs and Secure Multiparty Computation

Secure multiparty computation, a central tool from cryptographic theory, allows two or more parties to jointly and verifiably calculate the outcome of a commonly known function when the input to the function is shared among the various parties, so that no party learns anything about the other parties' inputs to the function beyond what could be deduced from just the outcome. This tool was used by prior work that discussed hiding bids in mechanism design to allow players to jointly calculate the output of a *commonly known* mechanism without anyone learning anything about others' types. Combining with the techniques of the current paper, one might implement the more secretive mediated protocol just presented in the following very high-level way, using both secure multiparty computation *and* zero-knowledge proofs:

0. Commitment randomness generation step: nature draws a uniformly random sequence ρ_c and publicly announces it.
- 1a. Commitment step: the mechanism designer, given ρ_c , chooses a commitment message (cryptographic commitment and non-interactive zero-knowledge proof parametrized by ρ_c that the commitment is to a description of an IR and DSIC mechanism) and publicly announces it.
- 1b. Commitment verification step: each of the players may inspect the commitment message (i.e., verify the zero-knowledge proof) to be convinced that the mechanism designer has committed to a description A of an IR and DSIC mechanism.
2. Run step: All players, as well as the mechanism designer, use secure multiparty computation (parametrized by ρ_c) to jointly compute $x = M_A(t, \rho_r)$ where A is the description to which the mechanism designer committed in the commitment step, t is the profile of the players' chosen types, and ρ_r is randomly drawn as part of the computation and is revealed to no one.⁷⁶ Whenever the mechanism designer sends any message as part of this secure multiparty computation, she also sends a zero-knowledge proof

⁷⁶Similarly in spirit to Section 5.2, here also one might construct the secure multiparty computation so that each agent (including even the mechanism designer) learns only a certain view of the outcome.

(parametrized by ρ_c) that this message is consistent with the description to which she committed in the commitment step. Each of the players may inspect each such message (i.e., verify the zero-knowledge proof) to be convinced that the mechanism designer is participating in a way consistent with the mechanism fixed in step 1a (as verified in step 1b).

While this approach is quite powerful, a few qualifications are in order here. First, participating in secure multiparty computation conducted over a communication channel enlarges the strategy space. As such, it is not surprising that in case there is more than one player, it paves the way to various threats (between the non-Stackelberg players, i.e., everyone except the mechanism designer) that erode the incentive properties of the overall protocol. This is a known limitation of using cryptographic tools to hide the types of the players (in prior work as well). This should be contrasted with our commit-and-run protocols from the previous sections, which due to the use of *noninteractive* zero-knowledge proofs, do not alter the players' strategy space and therefore do not erode any strategic properties (they do not hide the bids, but they do hide the mechanism). Second, secure multiparty computation conducted over a communication channel is susceptible to various coalitional cryptographic attacks: a large-enough fraction of the agents could jointly corrupt the computation and have it run a different mechanism or consider alternative reports for some players who are not among the coalition of adversaries. This is again a known limitation of using cryptographic tools to hide the types of the players (again, in prior work as well). This should be contrasted with our commit-and-run protocols from the previous sections, which not even the grand coalition of all players, or a coalition of the mechanism designer and all but one player, can compromise. One way to slightly mitigate such issues (both of which only manifest when there is more than one player) is to construct the secure multiparty computation protocol such that the first party who learns *anything* about the outcome is the mechanism designer, who at that point learns the entire outcome; Illustrative Example 5, given in Appendix E, has this feature. Such a construction removes any incentives for players to corrupt the computation due to any information that they learn about the outcome. This of course does not remove other incentives (unmodeled, existing before the computation even starts) to disrupt the computation. Finally, secure multiparty computation is often far more computationally demanding than zero-knowledge proofs, and hence the resulting protocols might be far less practically useful than our zero-knowledge protocols.

5.4 Beyond Mechanism Design

We conclude this section by describing two game-theoretic applications beyond mechanism design.

Sequential Games An analogue of our mechanism-design setting arises in sequential games if any player has commitment power (i.e., if there might be severe negative repercussions if the public declarations of such a player reveal some inconsistency). Such a player can cryptographically commit to her intended strategy at the onset, while only proving in zero-knowledge select properties thereof, such as consistency across histories of the sequential game (i.e., that the choice of action can only depend on the preceding history in specific ways; e.g., if this player’s strategy is to run a mechanism based on other players’ reports, one such type of consistency could be incentive compatibility of the mechanism, as studied in this paper so far). Then, whenever this player acts, she can prove in zero-knowledge that she does so in a way that is consistent with the strategy to which she cryptographically committed at the onset. Of course, more than one player can do so.

Correlated Equilibria and Communication Equilibria One of the earliest applications of cryptographic theory to game theory was to leverage secure multiparty computation to implement a commonly known correlated equilibrium by replacing a mediator with cheap talk (Dodis et al., 2000, 2007; Katz, 2008).⁷⁷ Our framework can be used here to implement a correlated equilibrium known only to a principal but not to any of the players, without any need for trust in the principal and without mediators. At the onset, the principal cryptographically commits to a mapping from random sequences of bits to action profiles, and proves in zero knowledge that if the input sequence is drawn uniformly at random, then the output recommendation is obedient. Then, nature draws a random sequence of bits, after which the principal discreetly provides each player with her recommended action, and proves in zero knowledge that it was calculated from the random sequence according to the obedient rules to which she cryptographically committed at the onset. Ben-Porath (2003) and Gerardi (2004) give (non-cryptographic) constructions that implements a commonly known communication equilibrium (Forges, 1986) in a Bayesian game by replacing a mediator with cheap talk. Similarly to the preceding discussion, an analog of the extension we describe in Section 5.3 can be used by a principal to implement an *undisclosed* communication equilibrium, without any need for trust in the principal, without mediators, and for any number of players.

6 Discussion

In this paper we build upon techniques from modern cryptographic theory to introduce a general framework for committing to, and running, any given mechanism without disclosing it and without revealing, even in retrospect, more than is revealed solely by the outcome. Virtually all of our definitions and guarantees are formalized in quite a starkly different man-

⁷⁷An earlier result of a similar nature, albeit not relying on cryptography, was given by Ben-Porath (1998); see also Gerardi (2004).

ner than any analogues of them would be in other models in the cryptographic literature, to put economic usefulness front and center. Our framework decouples commitment from disclosure, decouples trust in the process from transparency of the process, and requires no third parties or mediators, trusted or otherwise, all while maintaining strategic equivalence. We provide several concrete practical ready-to-run examples based on a novel zero-knowledge proof technique, as well as a general construction. We also give an extension that applies our techniques in the realm of contracts. The general construction is proved using a general, flexible “one-stop-shop wrapper” (see Appendix C) around all of the existing cryptographic tools (and definitions) needed in our proofs, which we hope to also be of independent use in other economic theory papers that may wish to avoid the learning curve associated with directly using other cryptographic definitions and tools.

In Section 5.3 we describe how to combine our framework with previous work to hide both the mechanism and the type reports. While by and large, previous papers on bid hiding were influenced by the aesthetic from the cryptographic literature of putting privacy front and center and aiming to hide as much as possible, voluntary revelation of information could have economic benefits. This is true for voluntary revelation of properties of the mechanism before it is run (e.g., of strategic or fairness properties), for voluntary revelation of information about type reports (say, only in aggregate), and for voluntary revelation of parts of the outcome to players for whom they are non-payoff-relevant (such as various success metrics as discussed in Section 5.2). We identify zero-knowledge proofs as thereby providing a general *unrevelation* principle of sorts for mechanism design, providing a fine lever through which arbitrary information of any of these kinds can be revealed or withheld. This paves the way for a further layer of *revelation design* following the design of the rules of the mechanism within mechanism design.

In this paper, our formal guarantees directly consider running a protocol once: The mechanism designer commits to a mechanism once, runs it once, and never uses the same commitment message again. Since in real-life settings, we expect a mechanism designer to run more than one mechanism in her lifetime, two remarks are in order. First, say that a mechanism designer uses our protocols more than once. In this case, our general construction guarantees that *overall*, the players would learn no more than they would have learned had the mechanism designer used the mediated environment for each of the runs. For example, if a mechanism designer uses our protocol to run the same deterministic mechanism twice, and the players report the same types (leading to the same outcome), then the players would have no way of telling whether it was the same mechanism twice, or two different mechanisms whose outcomes happen to coincide on this type report. Second, say that a mechanism designer, for some reason, reuses the same commitment message (and the same commitment

random bits are used) for two or more runs of a mechanism. In this case, our general construction guarantees that *overall*, the players would learn no more than they would have learned had the mechanism designer used the mediated environment for all runs and the mediator would have announced at the outset that the same mechanism will be used for all runs. For example, in the case of two runs, this would mean that the players would only know the output of the mechanism for two specific type profiles, where they would have the chance to choose the second type profile given the output for the first type profile. This latter property, of security despite reusing a commitment message, is not true in general for many cryptographic constructions (see, e.g., Canetti, 2006a,b), and follows from our constructions since our framework builds upon universally composable cryptographic building blocks (Canetti, 2020), with an eye toward the use of our protocols as building blocks within complex settings.

The need for secrecy depends on the broader context in which the mechanism is used; in some contexts it might be crucial, while in some it may not be important. Hiding the mechanism might however be desirable from a behavioral perspective even when secrecy is not a goal in and of itself. Guillen and Hakimov (2018) find that advising participants that the Top Trading Cycles matching mechanism is strategyproofness without describing the details of the mechanism increases truthtelling rates compared to when the mechanism is also described.⁷⁸ Not describing the mechanism, however, might raise issues of trust that a strategyproof mechanism is indeed run. Should the use of zero-knowledge proofs become mainstream like browser encryption has and gain the same public trust (as discussed in the introduction), our framework might provide a path toward similar increases in truthelling rates⁷⁹ in various mechanism design settings even when players do not *a priori* trust the mechanism designer. In this sense, our framework could also be viewed as contributing to recent literature on how to best present mechanisms to players (Gonczarowski et al., 2022, 2024).

In this paper we focus on the example of individual rationality and incentive compatibility as the properties of interest to be proven. However, that is merely an example, and our construction can easily work with any other property satisfied by the mechanism, so long as a reasonable-size proof could be furnished for this property.⁸⁰ For example, one could prove that a mechanism for bilateral trade is budget balanced, that a matching mechanism is stable, or that a voting mechanism has desirable properties such as various forms of fairness. One could even prove to regulators, without superfluously exposing trade secrets, that

⁷⁸Danz et al. (2022) show a different setting in which providing additional information contributes to strategic confusion and increases deviations from truthful reporting.

⁷⁹Non-truthtelling behavior has been observed when people interact with several common strategyproof mechanisms, including a sealed-bid second-price auction (Kagel and Levin, 1993) and the Deferred Acceptance stable matching mechanism (Hassidim et al., 2021; Shorrer and Sóvágó, 2017).

⁸⁰This really is only a technical constraint, as one would argue that any property known by the mechanism designer to hold would have such a proof; otherwise, how would the designer be convinced that it holds?

the mechanism abides by any relevant law, so long as this statement can be formalized.⁸¹ Sometimes, though, such statements cannot be formalized, whether because it is too hard or costly, or because one wishes to check whether the spirit, rather than the letter, of the law (or regulation) is upheld. Such applications, in which there might be no way around “eyeballing” the mechanism directly, do not fall within the scope of our framework. Another application we do not cover is choosing between mutually exclusive competing mechanisms or contracts offered by different principals, in which case just knowing that, e.g., each mechanism is IR and IC, or each contract satisfies IR and limited liability and incentivizes exertion of high effort, would not suffice. While secure multiparty computation could be used to evaluate a player’s choice function over the set of two proposed mechanisms/contracts while only revealing the final choice, formulating the details is outside of the scope of this paper.

References

- M. Babaioff, Y. A. Gonczarowski, and N. Nisan. The menu-size complexity of revenue approximation. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 134:281–307, 2022. Originally appeared in Proceedings of STOC’17.
- G. Barthe, M. Gaboardi, E. J. G. Arias, J. Hsu, A. Roth, and P.-Y. Strub. Computer-aided verification for mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE)*, pages 279–293, 2016.
- G. M. Becker, M. H. DeGroot, and J. Marschak. Measuring utility by a single-response sequential method. *Behavioral Science*, 9(3):226–232, 1964.
- E. Ben-Porath. Correlation without mediation: Expanding the set of equilibrium outcomes by “cheap” pre-play procedures. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 80(1):108–122, 1998.
- E. Ben-Porath. Cheap talk in games with incomplete information. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 108(1):45–71, 2003.
- D. J. Bernstein and T. Lange. Post-quantum cryptography. *Nature*, 549(7671):188–194, 2017.
- N. Bitansky, R. Canetti, A. Chiesa, S. Goldwasser, H. Lin, A. Rubinstein, and E. Tromer. The hunting of the SNARK. *Journal of Cryptology*, 30(4):989–1066, 2017.
- M. Blum. Coin flipping by telephone. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO ’81 Proceedings*, pages 11–15, 1981.
- P. Bogetoft, D. L. Christensen, I. Damgård, M. Geisler, T. Jakobsen, M. Krøigaard, J. D. Nielsen, J. B. Nielsen, K. Nielsen, J. Pagter, M. Schwartzbach, and T. Toft. Secure multiparty computation goes live. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 325–343, 2009.

⁸¹As part of an antitrust lawsuit, it has been claimed that Google had tweaked reserve prices in auctions (Nylen, 2023). A potential ability of firms to prove that their mechanisms abide by various antitrust regulations without divulging trade secrets might lower enforcement costs, which are currently very high (the FTC budget for FY2023 was \$430M, and its requested budget for FY2024 was \$590M (Schatz, 2023)).

- D. Boneh, J. Drake, B. Fisch, and A. Gabizon. Halo infinite: Proof-carrying data from additive polynomial commitments. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO 2021 Proceedings*, pages 649–680, 2021.
- F. Brandt. How to obtain full privacy in auctions. *International Journal Information Security*, 5: 201–216, 2006.
- R. Canetti. Security and composition of cryptographic protocols: a tutorial (part i). *SIGACT News*, 37(3):67–92, 2006a.
- R. Canetti. Security and composition of cryptographic protocols: a tutorial (part ii). *SIGACT News*, 37(4):58–84, 2006b.
- R. Canetti. Universally composable security. *Journal of the ACM*, 67(5):28:1–28:94, 2020.
- K. Cook. *Kitty Genovese: The Murder, the Bystanders, the Crime that Changed America*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- J. Čopić and C. Ponsatí. Robust bilateral trade and mediated bargaining. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6(2–3):570–580, 2008.
- R. Cramer, I. Damgård, and B. Schoenmakers. Proofs of partial knowledge and simplified design of witness hiding protocols. In Y. Desmedt, editor, *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO '94 Proceedings*, pages 174–187, 1994.
- Z. Cullen and R. Perez-Truglia. How much does your boss make? the effects of salary comparisons. *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(3):766–822, 2022.
- D. Danz, L. Vesterlund, and A. J. Wilson. Belief elicitation and behavioral incentive compatibility. *American Economic Review*, 112(9):2851–83, 2022.
- C. Daskalakis, A. Deckelbaum, and C. Tzamos. The complexity of optimal mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1302–1318, 2014.
- S. Dobzinski. Computational efficiency requires simple taxation. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 209–218, 2016.
- Y. Dodis, S. Halevi, and T. Rabin. A cryptographic solution to a game theoretic problem. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO 2000 Proceedings*, pages 112–130, 2000.
- Y. Dodis, S. Halevi, and T. Rabin. Cryptography and game theory. In N. Nisan, T. Roughgarden, É. Tardos, and V. V. Vazirani, editors, *Algorithmic Game Theory*, pages 181–205. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- J. Doerner, D. Evans, and a. shelat. Secure stable matching at scale. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, CCS '16, pages 1602–1613, 2016.
- P. Dworczak. Mechanism design with aftermarkets: Cutoff mechanisms. *Econometrica*, 88(6): 2629–2661, 2020.
- C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of TCC*, pages 265–284, 2006.

- F. Ederer, R. Holden, and M. Meyer. Gaming and strategic opacity in incentive provision. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 49(4):819–854, 2018.
- R. Eilat, K. Eliaz, and X. Mu. Privacy preserving auctions. Discussion Paper 18662, CEPR, 2023.
- M. V. X. Ferreira and S. M. Weinberg. Credible, truthful, and two-round (optimal) auctions via cryptographic commitments. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 683–712, 2020.
- A. Fiat and A. Shamir. How to prove yourself: Practical solutions to identification and signature problems. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO ’86 Proceedings*, pages 186–194, 1986.
- F. Forges. An approach to communication equilibria. *Econometrica*, 54(6):1375–1385, 1986.
- D. Gerardi. Unmediated communication in games with complete and incomplete information. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 114(1):104–131, 2004.
- A. Ghosh, T. Roughgarden, and M. Sundararajan. Universally utility-maximizing privacy mechanisms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(6):1673–1693, 2012. Originally appeared in Proceedings of STOC’09.
- O. Goldreich, S. Micali, and A. Wigderson. How to play any mental game. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, page 218–229, 1987.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski. Bounding the menu-size of approximately optimal auctions via optimal-transport duality. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 123–131, 2018.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski and N. Nisan. *Mathematical Logic through Python*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski, L. Kovalio, N. Nisan, , and A. Romm. Matching for the israeli ”mechinot” gap-year programs: Handling rich diversity requirements. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, page 321, 2019a.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski, N. Nisan, R. Ostrovsky, and W. Rosenbaum. A stable marriage requires communication. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 118:626–647, 2019b. Originally appeared in Proceedings of SODA’15.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski, O. Heffetz, and C. Thomas. Strategyproofness-exposing mechanism descriptions. Mimeo, 2022.
- Y. A. Gonczarowski, G. Heffetz, Ori Ishai, and C. Thomas. Describing deferred acceptance and strategyproofness to participants: Experimental analysis. Mimeo, 2024.
- J. Groth. On the size of pairing-based non-interactive arguments. In *Advances in Cryptology: EUROCRYPT 2016 Proceedings*, pages 305–326, 2016.
- P. Guillen and R. Hakimov. The effectiveness of top-down advice in strategy-proof mechanisms: A field experiment. *European Economic Review*, 101:505–511, 2018.
- A. Hassidim, , A. Romm, and R. I. Shorrer. The limits of incentives in economic matching procedures. *Management Science*, 67(2):951–963, 2021.

- A. A. Haupt and Z. K. Hitzig. Contextually private mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, page 1144, 2022.
- J. Hörner and N. Vieille. Public vs. private offers in the market for lemons. *Econometrica*, 77(1): 29–69, 2009.
- S. Izmalkov, M. Lepinski, and S. Micali. Perfect implementation. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 71(1):121–140, 2011.
- X. Jarque, C. Ponsatí, and J. Sákovics. Mediation: incomplete information bargaining with filtered communication. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 39(7):803–830, 2003.
- J. H. Kagel and D. Levin. Independent private value auctions: Bidder behaviour in first-, second-and third-price auctions with varying numbers of bidders. *Economic Journal*, 103(419):868–879, 1993.
- E. Kamenica and M. Gentzkow. Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6): 2590–2615, 2011.
- J. Katz. Bridging game theory and cryptography: Recent results and future directions. In *Proceedings of Theory of Cryptography (TCC)*, pages 251–272, 2008.
- E. Maskin and J. Tirole. The principal-agent relationship with an informed principal: The case of private values. *Econometrica*, 58(2):379–409, 1990.
- S. Micali and M. O. Rabin. Cryptography miracles, secure auctions, matching problem verification. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(2):85–93, 2014.
- B. Moldovanu and M. Tietzel. Goethe’s second-price auction. *Journal of Political Economy*, 106 (4):854–859, 1998.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Post-quantum cryptography, 2022. URL <https://csrc.nist.gov/Projects/post-quantum-cryptography>.
- N. Nisan and I. Segal. The communication requirements of efficient allocations and supporting prices. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 129(1):192–224, 2006.
- L. Nylen. Google tweaks ad auctions to hit revenue target, exec says. Bloomberg, 2023. URL <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-09-18/google-tweaks-ad-auctions-to-hit-revenue-targets-executive-says>.
- D. C. Parkes, M. O. Rabin, S. M. Shieber, and C. Thorpe. Practical secrecy-preserving, verifiably correct and trustworthy auctions. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 7(3): 294–312, 2008. Originally appeared in Proceedings of ICEC’06.
- D. C. Parkes, M. O. Rabin, and C. Thorpe. Cryptographic combinatorial clock-proxy auctions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 305–324, 2009.
- A. Rubinstein and J. Zhao. The randomized communication complexity of randomized auctions. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, page 882–895, 2021.

- A. Rubinstein, R. R. Saxena, C. Thomas, S. M. Weinberg, and J. Zhao. Exponential communication separations between notions of selfishness. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 947–960, 2021.
- T. Schatz. Disaster thrives at lina khan’s ftc. Boston Herald, 2023. URL <https://www.bostonherald.com/2023/07/31/schatz-disaster-thrives-at-lina-khans-ftc/>.
- I. Segal. The communication requirements of social choice rules and supporting budget sets. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 136(1):341–378, 2007.
- P. W. Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(5):1484–1509, 1997.
- R. I. Shorrer and S. Sóvágó. Obvious mistakes in a strategically simple college admissions environment. Discussion Paper 2017-107/V, Tinbergen Institute, 2017.

A Formal Proofs and Tools for the Illustrative Examples from Section 2

In this appendix, we formalize the illustrative examples from Section 2 as commit-and-run protocol catalogs (up to the added interaction during proofs), and prove they are implementing, committing, hiding (even strongly so), and feasibly computable.

A.1 Proofs of Knowledge of Discrete Log

Our illustrative examples from Section 2 use a special form of zero-knowledge proofs to prove knowledge of the discrete logarithms of elements in a large algebraic group G . We first define this special form, called Sigma protocols (not to be confused with our commit-and-run protocols from Section 4), and then describe the actual protocols.

A.1.1 Sigma Protocols

Sigma protocols are a convenient form of proofs. The formulation here restates the standard one without explicitly defining the concept of a security parameter.

Definition A.1. A *Sigma protocol* for a relation $R(x, w)$, where x is a commonly known *statement* and w is a (typically secret) *witness* to the fact that x satisfies the property represented by R , is a three-message interaction between a randomized prover algorithm P and a randomized verifier algorithm V . The verifier's (single) message consists of a uniformly random element from a prespecified domain G , and the final decision made by the verifier is a deterministic function of the common input x and the three messages. Furthermore, the following properties hold:

- **Completeness:** For any $(x, w) \in R$, for any first message α generated by the prover given (x, w) , and for any verifier message $\beta \in G$, we have that the verifier *accepts* when given $(x, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, where γ is the corresponding response message γ computed by the prover algorithm. In short,

$$\Pr[V(x, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \text{"accept"} \mid \alpha \sim P(x, w), \beta \in G, \gamma \sim P(x, w, \beta)] = 1.$$

- **Knowledge Extraction:** There exists a deterministic procedure K whose running time is polylogarithmic in $|G|$, that given any two accepting transcripts that share the same input x and first message α , outputs a witness w such that $(x, w) \in R$. That is, for any x, α , and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in G$ such that $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$, and any γ_1, γ_2 such that $V(x, \alpha, \beta_1, \gamma_1) = V(x, \alpha, \beta_2, \gamma_2) = \text{accept}$, we have $(x, w) \in R$ where $w = K(x, \alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.
- **Perfect Witness Indistinguishability:** For any input x and two witnesses w_1, w_2

such that $(x, w_1) \in R$ and $(x, w_2) \in R$, and any (potentially misbehaving) verifier V^* , it holds that the output of V^* from an interaction with P that has input (x, w_1) is distributed identically to the output of V^* from an interaction with P that has input (x, w_2) .

A.1.2 The Schnorr and CDS Protocols

For completeness we recall the Cramer–Damgård–Schoenmakers (Cramer et al., 1994) protocol for proving knowledge of the discrete logarithm of one out of a set of group elements (henceforth, we call this protocol CDS). CDS is a Sigma protocol, and while we do not do so for simplicity of our constructions, we note that under certain computational infeasibility assumptions, all verifier interaction can be removed from it.¹

The Schnorr protocol. As a preliminary step to presenting CDS, we also recall the Schnorr protocol for proving knowledge of the discrete logarithm of a commonly known group element (Schnorr, 1991). Let G be a group of large prime order and let g, a be elements of G . Assume the prover wants to convince the verifier that she knows ρ such that $g^\rho = a$, while making sure that the verifier learns nothing else in the process. The protocol proceeds as follows:

1. The prover draws $s \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$, and sends $\alpha = g^s$ to the verifier.
2. The verifier draws $\beta \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ and sends to prover.
3. The prover sends $\gamma = s + \beta\rho$ to the verifier.
4. The verifier accepts if $g^\gamma = \alpha a^\beta$.

It is easy to verify that if both parties follow the protocol, then the verifier accepts.

For knowledge extraction, if β, γ and β', γ' are two challenge-response pairs that convince the verifier w.r.t. the same α , then $\beta\rho - \gamma = s = \beta'\rho - \gamma'$, thus $\rho = \frac{\gamma - \gamma'}{\beta' - \beta}$.

While perfect witness indistinguishability is moot for proofs of knowledge of discrete logarithms (since the witness is unique), the protocol is *honest-verifier zero knowledge*. That is, V 's view of the interaction with the prover (namely, a, α, β, γ) can be feasibly simulated given only a . Indeed, to draw appropriately distributed $(\alpha, \beta\gamma)$, first independently draw $\beta, \gamma \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$, then set $\alpha = \frac{g^\gamma}{a^\beta}$.

The Cramer–Damgård–Schoenmakers protocol. CDS extends the Schnorr protocol to the case where the prover wants to convince the verifier that she knows the discrete log of at least one out of several commonly known numbers $a_1, \dots, a_k \in G$, while making sure that the verifier learns nothing else in the process. In particular the verifier does not learn to which of the a_i s the discrete log corresponds.

¹For readers with background in cryptography: by this we mean that CDS can be made into non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs of knowledge (in the random oracle model), using the Fiat-Shamir transform (Fiat and Shamir, 1986).

In a nutshell, the idea is to have the prover and verifier run k copies of the Schnorr protocol, where the verifier allows the prover to choose the k challenges, subject to the constraint that all the challenges sum up to a single “master challenge” that the verifier chooses. This allows to the prover to perform the simulation strategy of the Schnorr protocol for all but one of the k copies (the one corresponding to the discrete logarithm that is supposedly known).

The protocol proceeds as follows. The common input is $a_1, \dots, a_k \in G$, and the prover knows (ρ, i) such that $g^\rho = a_i$. Then:

1. The prover sends $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ to the verifier, where:
 - (a) $\alpha_i = g^s$, $s \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$
 - (b) For $j \neq i$, $\alpha_j = \frac{g^{\gamma_j}}{a_j^{\beta_j}}$, where $\beta_j, \gamma_j \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ independently.
2. The verifier draws $\beta \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ and sends to prover.
3. The prover sets $\beta_i = \beta - \sum_{j \neq i} \beta_j$, $\gamma_i = s + \beta_i \rho$, and sends to the verifier the values $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$.
4. The verifier accepts if $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k = \beta \pmod{p}$, and in addition for all $j = 1, \dots, k$ it holds that $g^{\gamma_j} = \alpha_j a_j^{\beta_j}$.

Perfect witness indistinguishability is immediate. Completeness and knowledge extraction are argued in similarly to the Schnorr protocol. (For the extraction argument, observe that if $\beta, (\vec{\gamma}, \vec{\beta})$ and $\beta', (\vec{\gamma}', \vec{\beta}')$ are two challenge-response pairs with $\beta \neq \beta'$ that convince the verifier w.r.t. the same \vec{a} , then there must exist an i such that $\beta_i \neq \beta'_i$. For this i we have $g^{\gamma_i} / a_i^{\beta_i} = \alpha_i = g^{\gamma'_i} / a_i^{\beta'_i}$, thus $a_i = g^{\frac{\gamma_i - \gamma'_i}{\beta'_i - \beta_i}}$.)

A.1.3 A New Extension

We describe a new extension of CDS. The extension considers commonly known $a_{1,1}, \dots, a_{k,m}, g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{k,m}$; in this Sigma protocol the prover proves that there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that for every j , she knows $\log_{g_{i,j}} a_{i,j}$.

Before we present this extension of CDS, we first present a Sigma protocol that is a straightforward extension of the Schnorr protocol, where a prover proves that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ she knows $\log_{g_i} a_i$, where a_1, \dots, a_k and g_1, \dots, g_k are commonly known. While this could also be done by running k copies of the Schnorr protocol, we avoid doing so because that would not be a useful building block for our extension of CDS.

Extension of Schnorr. Let $a_1, \dots, a_k, g_1, \dots, g_k \in G$. The prover wants to convince the verifier in zero knowledge that she knows ρ_1, \dots, ρ_k such that $g_i^{\rho_i} = a_i$ for every i . The protocol proceeds as follows:

1. The prover independently draws $s_1, \dots, s_k \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$, and sends $\vec{\alpha} = \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ to the verifier, where $\alpha_i = g_i^{s_i}$ for every i .

2. The verifier draws $\beta \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ and sends to prover.
3. The prover sends $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$ to the verifier, where $\gamma_i = s_i + \beta \rho_i$ for every i .
4. The verifier accepts if $g_i^{\gamma_i} = \alpha_i a_i^\beta$ for every i .

Completeness, knowledge extraction, and perfect witness indistinguishability follow in the same way as for the Schnorr protocol. Note that the proof uses only a single verifier challenge; this property will be useful for the extension of CDS described next.

Extension of CDS. Let $a_{i,j}, g_{i,j} \in G$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$. The prover wants to convince the verifier in zero knowledge that she knows $(i, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_m)$ such that $g_{i,j}^{\rho_j} = a_{i,j}$ for every j . The protocol proceeds as follows:

1. The prover sends $\alpha_{1,1}, \dots, \alpha_{k,m}$ to the verifier where, for every $j = 1, \dots, m$:
 - (a) $\alpha_{i,j} = g_{i,j}^{s_j}$, $s_j \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$.
 - (b) For $i' \neq i$, $\alpha_{i',j} = \frac{g_{i',j}^{\gamma_{i',j}}}{a_{i',j}^{\beta_{i',j}}}$, where $\beta_{i'}, \gamma_{i',j} \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ independently.
2. The verifier draws $\beta \sim U\{1, \dots, p\}$ and sends to prover.
3. The prover sets $\beta_i = \beta - \sum_{i' \neq i} \beta_{i'}$, and $\gamma_{i,j} = s_j + \beta_i r$ for every j , and sends to the verifier the values $\gamma_{1,1}, \dots, \gamma_{k,m}, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$.
4. The verifier accepts if $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k = \beta \pmod{p}$, and in addition for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$ it holds that $g_{i,j}^{\gamma_{i,j}} = \alpha_{i,j} a_{i,j}^{\beta_i}$.

Completeness and perfect witness indistinguishability are argued similarly to CDS (replacing the Schnorr protocol with the above extension as a building block). For knowledge extraction, observe that if $\beta, (\vec{\gamma}, \vec{\beta})$ and $\beta', (\vec{\gamma}', \vec{\beta}')$ are two challenge-response pairs with $\beta \neq \beta'$ that convince the verifier w.r.t. the same $\vec{\alpha}$, then there exists i such that $\beta_i \neq \beta'_i$. For this i and for all $j = 1, \dots, m$ we have $g_{i,j}^{\gamma_{i,j}} / a_{i,j}^{\beta_i} = \alpha_{i,j} = g_{i,j}^{\gamma'_{i,j}} / a_{i,j}^{\beta'_i}$, thus $a_{i,j} = g_{i,j}^{\frac{\gamma_{i,j} - \gamma'_{i,j}}{\beta'_i - \beta_i}}$.

A.2 Proof for Illustrative Examples 1 and 2

We formalize Illustrative Example 2 from Section 2; Illustrative Example 1 is a special case. Let $H \in \mathbb{N}$ be a power of 2. Let $T = T_1 = \{0, \dots, H-1\}^2$, each $t \in T$ indicating the buyer's value for each item. We choose a mechanism description language in which each mechanism description is exactly $2\log_2 H$ bits long, interpreted as pairs of prices in $\{0, \dots, H-1\}$. It suffices to only consider specifications with $L_a = 2\log_2 H$ (bigger L_a would be equivalent, and smaller L_a would have no valid mechanism descriptions), with $L_p = 0$ (since all mechanisms describable in our language are IR and IC), and with $n_r = 0$ (since all such mechanisms are deterministic). Running any such mechanism on a given type report can always be done in time linear in L_a , say, in time $100 \cdot L_a$, so it suffices to only consider specifications with $R = 100 \cdot L_a$. So, we must construct a protocol for every $B \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let G be a group of large prime order p to be chosen later as a function of B and ε . To

ease presentation, we assume that ρ_c , rather than being a uniformly random sequence of n_c bits, is a pair (g, h) of uniformly random elements in G . We take $L_c = 2\log_2 H \lceil \log p \rceil$ and interpret a commitment message as $2\log_2 H$ commitments to bits ($\log_2 H$ commitments for each price, each of them an element of G). ψ_c simply verifies that each of these $2\log_2 H$ bit commitments is an element of G .²

As already noted, the proof of properly running the mechanism will be interactive in this protocol, so instead of defining L_r and ψ_r , we will define an interactive protocol and prove slightly generalized versions of our properties. First, we will be mindful that the total number of bits sent during the run stage of the interactive protocol satisfy the requirements we place on L_r in feasibly computable protocol catalogs, and that the total computational power required by the buyer during the run stage satisfies the computational constraints we place on ψ_r in feasibly computable protocol catalogs. Second, the definition of a *committing protocol* also has to be generalized for interactive protocols. We say that the protocol is committing for a mechanism designer's running-time bound B and attack-success probability ε if for every mechanism designer strategy (S_c, S_r) computable in time at most B the following holds. For every $\rho_d \in \{0, 1\}^{n_d}$, there exists a (not necessarily feasibly computable) function E (which we call a *mechanism extractor*) from pairs $\rho_c = (g, h)$ of elements in G to IR and IC mechanism descriptions, such that: With probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ over $\rho_c \in U(G^2)$ **and over the random choices made by the buyer during the interactive verification stage**, for every $t \in T$, if both commitment verification and run verification succeed (the former always succeeds in this specific protocol), then the mechanism that was run is M_A for $A = E(\rho_c)$.

The playbook is defined as in Section 2: \hat{S}_c commits to two prices as described there, and \hat{S}_r (interactively) proves correctness as described there, and uses (the interactive) CDS (see Appendix A.1) if a zero-knowledge proof of knowledge of a discrete logarithm in a given base of one or more elements from a set is called for.

The fact that our protocol is *implementing* follows from the completeness of CDS (see Appendix A.1). To see that it is *strongly hiding* (and hence, by Lemma B.1, *hiding*), we define a simulator that chooses commitment random bits ρ'_c by uniformly drawing an element $g' \in G$, uniformly and independently drawing $\rho \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and setting ρ'_c to be the pair of elements (g', h') where $h' = g'^\rho$. These are distributed as two i.i.d. uniform elements from G , i.e., distributed identically to a random ρ_c , and so are impossible to distinguish from such a random sequence. To generate any single commitment to a bit, the simulator uniformly draws a random number $\rho' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and sends the element $C' = h'^{\rho'}$. This element is once again

²This can be feasibly done (i.e., done in time polylogarithmic in $|G|$) for the groups based on Sophie Germaine primes and safe primes as mentioned in Section 2, since verifying that an element of the larger group is a square (i.e., is indeed an element of the smaller group) can be feasibly done since the order of the big group, $q - 1$, is known.

distributed uniformly in G , as in our protocol when the (commitment) playbook is used, so impossible to distinguish. The crucial difference, however, is that the simulator, due to being able to control ρ'_c , can feasibly “open” each such commitment bit both as $x' = 1$ (writing it as $C' = h^{\rho'}$) and as $x' = 0$ (writing it as $C' = g^{\rho'}$). Therefore, after the outcome is announced, the simulator “retroactively” chooses some pair of prices consistent with the outcome and type reports, and runs the run playbook as if the commitment were to these prices.

It is enough to show that for any mechanism description and adversary, the distribution over transcripts of this simulator is identical to that of our protocol when the playbook is used, as this would imply that no distinguisher can guess with probability greater than half whether a transcript originates from our protocol or from the simulation. By perfect witness indistinguishability of CDS, the distributions are indeed identical despite the simulator choosing *some* mechanism that is consistent with the outcome rather than the *specific* mechanism that the seller has in mind. Note that the same protocol is hiding, and even strongly so, for all B and ε : its hiding guarantee is absolute—even a computationally unbounded adversary (a stronger guarantee than for a computationally bounded one) cannot guess the origin of a transcript with probability greater than half (a stronger guarantee than not guessing with probability nonnegligibly greater than half).

It remains to choose the group size p based on B and ε so that the protocol can be shown to be *committing*, and to verify that with this choice of p it is *feasibly computable*. Let $B' = 8 \cdot |T| \cdot B/\varepsilon$. There is broad confidence among cryptographers and computational complexity theorists that choosing the size p of the group G to be a large-enough polynomial in B'/ε suffices for guaranteeing that no algorithm with computing power at most B' can calculate the discrete logarithm of h base g for uniformly random g, h in G with probability greater than $\varepsilon/6$. This widely believed computational infeasibility assumption is used in practice in many cryptographic systems around the world, and breaking it would result in the ability to break into those systems.³ Note that with this choice of p , representing elements of G , drawing random elements of G , and calculating multiplication and addition in G can all be done in time polylogarithmic (and, in particular, subpolynomial) in B and $1/\varepsilon$, and therefore the protocol is *feasibly computable*. To show that the protocol is *committing* with this choice of p (given the above widely believed computational infeasibility assumption), we show that an adversary that breaks the commitment property can be used to build an algorithm with computing power at most B' that can calculate the discrete logarithm of h base g for uniformly random g, h in G with probability greater than $\varepsilon/6$, contradicting the

³The best known algorithms for computing discrete logarithms in \mathbb{Z}_q for prime q run in time $\Theta(q^{1/3})$. Any significant improvement will be a major mathematical breakthrough that would break the security of such systems.

computational infeasibility assumption.

Let (S_c, S_r) be a mechanism-designer strategy computable in time at most B , and let $\rho_d \in \{0,1\}^{n_d}$. We will define $E: G^2 \rightarrow \{0, \dots, H-1\}^2$ by defining $E(\rho_c)$ to be the pair of prices s^1, s^2 as follows. (We give an algorithmic definition because we will later be interested in the running time of $E(\rho_c)$.) Initialize s^1, s^2 to be the maximum possible price, $H-1$. Next, for each $(v_1, v_2) \in T$, run (S_c, S_r) with mechanism-designer bits ρ_d , commitment bits ρ_c , and type report (v_1, v_2) . If the first (respectively, second) item is sold and the verification of the revealed price succeeds (i.e., the commitment to the price is opened to the price claimed in the outcome), then update s^1 (respectively, s^2) to be the price at which it is sold.

We now prove that E satisfies the guarantees in the definition of a committing protocol. Assume for contradiction that for some (S_c, S_r) computable in time at most B and some $\rho_d \in \{0,1\}^{n_d}$ there exists $R_v \subset G^3$ with measure greater than ε such that for each $(\rho_c, \rho_v) \in R_v$, where $\rho_c \in G^2$ is interpreted as a commitment (random) sequence and $\rho_v \in G$ is interpreted as a (random) challenge to CDS during verification, there exists $t_{\rho_c, \rho_v} \in T$ such that verification succeeds but the outcome is not $M_{s^1, s^2}(t_{\rho_c, \rho_v})$. We use (S_c, S_r, ρ_d) to construct an algorithm Π with running time at most B' (as defined above) that takes two random element in $g, h \in G$ and with probability greater than ε computes ℓ such that $g^\ell = h$ (in G). This contradicts the assumption of the infeasibility of calculating a discrete logarithm in G .

The algorithm Π runs as follows on input (g, h) . Set $\rho_c = (g, h)$ and run S_c with mechanism-designer bits ρ_d on ρ_c to obtain the commitment message $D_c = (C_1^1, \dots, C_{\log_2 H}^1, C_1^2, \dots, C_{\log_2 H}^2)$. Next, for each $(v_1, v_2) \in T$, run (S_c, S_r) (or run S_r from where S_c stopped) with mechanism-designer bits ρ_d , commitment bits ρ_c , and type report (v_1, v_2) to obtain the outcome. For each such (v_1, v_2) , if the outcome declared by S_r is *not* $M_{E(\rho_c)}(v_1, v_2)$, then proceed as follows. We consider two cases. The first case is where the outcome of S_r for the current value of (v_1, v_2) sells one of the items, w.l.o.g. item 1, for a price different than the one prescribed by $E(\rho_c)$. In this case, verification is by opening the commitment to the price of item 1, and therefore verification does not involve any challenges. Finish running S_r to run the verification. If verification succeeds, then it means that there exist $(v_1, v_2), (v'_1, v'_2) \in T$ (the latter one is the one that defines the price when running E) such that when run with each of these two reports, S_r opened the commitment to the price of item 1 into two different prices. In turn, this means that C_j^1 for some j was opened by S_r into both 0 and 1, i.e., it outputs values ρ, ρ' such that $g^\rho = h^{\rho'} = C_j^1$. In this case (if verification succeeds), Π computes ℓ such that $\rho\ell = \rho'$ in G (this can be feasibly done) and returns it.

The second case is where the outcome of S_r for the current value of (v_1, v_2) does not sell an item, w.l.o.g. the first item, even though based on the prices $(s^1, s^2) = E(\rho_c)$ it should have been sold. In this case, verification is by CDS and involves a random challenge. This

means that there exist $(v_1, v_2), (v'_1, v'_2) \in T$ (again, the latter one is the one that defined the price when running E) such that when running with (v'_1, v'_2) , S_r opens the commitment to the price of item 1 into the price s^1 while when running with (v_1, v_2) , S_r claims that the price of item 1 is greater than s' for some value $s' \geq s^1$, and attempts to prove this during verification. More specifically, there exist i_1, \dots, i_ℓ such that when running with (v'_1, v'_2) every $C_{i_j}^1$ is opened to 0, i.e., a discrete log base g of $C_{i_j}^1$ is revealed, but when running with (v_1, v_2) , S_r claims that it knows how to represent one of these commitments as a commitment to 1, i.e., knows a discrete log base h of one of the $C_{i_j}^1$ s, and attempts to prove this using CDS during verification. In this case, Π repeats the following $4/\varepsilon$ times: sample $\rho_v \in G$ and finish running S_r from immediately after the outcome was announced, to run the verification with challenge ρ_v . If verification succeeds for at least two sampled values ρ_v^1, ρ_v^2 , then run the knowledge extractor or CDS on the verification transcripts for these two values to obtain a discrete logarithm base h of one of the $C_{i_j}^1$ s. We then once again have discrete logarithms in both base g and base h of a commitment, so we continue in the same way as in the first case.

Note that the running time of Π is indeed at most B' (it runs (S_c, S_r) at most $2 \cdot |T| \cdot (1 + 4/\varepsilon)$ times, and in addition only performs operations that are polylogarithmic in $|G|$, which are fast enough to not take the overall running time over B'). It remains to show that Π succeeds with probability greater than $\varepsilon/6$ over uniformly chosen g, h . Note that R_v being of measure greater than ε implies that there is a measure greater than $\varepsilon/2$ of pairs $\rho_c = (g, h)$ of elements in G such that for each of them with probability greater than $\varepsilon/2$ over the random choice of challenge during verification, there exists $t_{\rho_c, \rho_v} \in T$ such that verification succeeds but the outcome is not $M_{s^1, s^2}(t_{\rho_c, \rho_v})$. (Otherwise, the measure of R_v is at most $\varepsilon/2 \cdot 1 + (1 - \varepsilon/2) \cdot \varepsilon/2 < \varepsilon$.) For each such pair $\rho_c = (g, h)$, we have that Π succeeds with probability at least $(1 - (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{2/\varepsilon})^2 > (1 - 1/e)^2 > 1/3$ (the first expression is the probability of a single success in the first $2/\varepsilon$ samples and a single success in the last $2/\varepsilon$ samples). Therefore, Π succeeds with probability greater than $\varepsilon/6$ over uniformly random $(g, h) \in G^2$, as required.

B Strong Hiding: A Simulation-Based Approach

In this appendix, we provide a hiding guarantee that is stronger than Definition 4.3, and which is also satisfied by all of our constructions. We call this guarantee *strong hiding*. While Definition 4.3 is based on the idea of indistinguishability of two runs of our protocol, *strong hiding* is based on the idea that nothing should be learned from a run of our protocol that cannot be learned from a corresponding run of the mediated protocol. More precisely, it guarantees that despite the absence of a trusted third party, with high probability computationally bounded players, even if they all join forces, learn no more about the mechanism than they would have in the mediated protocol with a (rightfully) trusted third party had

they had slightly more computation power.

The way by which we formalize the idea that the players learn nothing more in our protocol than in the mediated protocol is again through indistinguishability, but not between two runs of our protocol as in Definition 4.3. Rather, players are not able to distinguish whether they are participating in our protocol or in mediated one. This idea seems flawed in first glance: players can distinguish between the two protocols since in our protocol they observe ρ_c , D_c , and D_r , which they do not observe in the mediated protocol (and they might plausibly learn something from these).

To overcome this flaw and formally define this idea of indistinguishability, we draw inspiration from the notion of *simulation*, which repeatedly appears in modern cryptography. The idea is to complement the mediated protocol with a computationally feasible algorithm, called a *simulator*, which—like the players—does not have access to the mechanism description (known only to the mechanism designer and the trusted third party), and which is tasked with generating some values ρ_c , D_c , and D_r . If, despite not having access to the mechanism, the simulator can generate ρ_c , D_c , and D_r such that computationally bounded players cannot distinguish between the following two *transcripts*:

- the transcript $(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ of the mediated protocol augmented with a simulator (where t , ρ_r , and x are observed in the mediated protocol, and ρ_c , D_c , and D_r are generated by the simulator), and
- the transcript $(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ of our protocol,

then we conclude that the players learn no more in our protocol than they could have learned in the mediated protocol augmented with the simulator. (Indeed, had they learned anything more in our protocol, then they could have distinguished between the two protocols based on whether or not they learned this.)

The simulator is only a thought experiment. Consider a players who can put in some extra effort to run the simulator herself, as part of their strategy in the mediated protocol. (Recall that the simulator does not require access to the hidden mechanism.) Such players then learn no more from our protocol than their would have from running the simulator themselves in the mediated protocol. Overall, the existence of an appropriate simulator thus formalizes a guarantee that anything about the mechanism that is unknown to the players in the mediated protocol remains unknown to them in our protocol.

Since we would like to keep the mechanism hidden even if all players join forces, one concern is that the players, through jointly crafting their type profile as a function of the commitment random bits and commitment message, might in some way learn something about the hidden mechanism. Let us define a *joint player strategy* as a function $\hat{t}: \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \rightarrow T$, taking the commitment bits ρ_c and commitment message D_c and choosing which type profile t

to report. As discussed after Definition 4.3, we would like for the mechanism description be hidden even if it is chosen in a way that depends on ρ_c . Let us define a *mechanism-choosing strategy* as a pair (\hat{A}, \hat{P}) where $\hat{A} : \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{L_a, R}$ and $\hat{P} : \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{L_p}$ such that the following *consistency requirement* is met: for every $\rho_c \in \{0,1\}^{n_c}$, we have that $\hat{P}(\rho_c)$ is a (valid) proof that $\hat{A}(\rho_c)$ is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R . Finally, for even further security, we would like for the mechanism description be hidden even if in some specific implementation ρ_r is somehow (even unbeknownst to any agent) correlated with ρ_c . Let us define a *run-bits-choosing strategy* (for nature) as a function $\hat{\rho}_r : \{0,1\}^{n_c} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{n_r}$.

Formally, the mediated protocol with a (rightfully) trusted third party is augmented with a (randomized) *simulator* as follows:

1. The simulator chooses $\rho'_c \in \{0,1\}$ and $D'_c \in \{0,1\}^{L_c}$.
2. The mechanism designer hands the mechanism description $\hat{A}(\rho_c)$ and the proof $\hat{P}(\rho_c)$ to the trusted third party. (Note that due to the definition of the mediated protocol in Section 3.4 and the above consistency requirement from \hat{A} and \hat{P} , the trusted third party publicly declares the proof as valid.)
3. Player types are set as $t' = \hat{t}(\rho_c, D_c)$, the run bits are set as $\rho'_r = \hat{\rho}_r(\rho_c)$, and the type profile t' and run bits ρ'_r are given to the mechanism designer in the mediated protocol. Based upon t' and ρ'_r , the mechanism designer announces the outcome $x' \in X$ s.t. $x' = M_{\hat{A}(\rho_c)}(t', \rho'_r)$. (Note that due to the definition of the mediated protocol in Section 3.4, the trusted third party publicly declares the outcome as correct.)
4. The simulator chooses $D'_r \in \{0,1\}^{L_r}$.
5. The *transcript* of the simulation is $(\rho'_c, D'_c, t', \rho'_r, x', D'_r)$.

As discussed above, we will require the existence of a simulator such that the transcript of the simulation is indistinguishable to players who use any joint player strategy from the transcript of our protocol, regardless of which mechanism-choosing strategy and run-bits-choosing strategy are used. To formalize this, we define a *distinguisher* to be a function $\mathcal{D} : \{0,1\}^{n_c} \times \{0,1\}^{L_c} \times T \times \{0,1\}^{n_r} \times X \times \{0,1\}^{L_r} \rightarrow \{\text{"real"}, \text{"simulated"}\}$, which is given a transcript $(\rho_c'', D_c'', t'', \rho_r'', x'', D_r'')$ and attempts to “guess” whether it originates from our protocol (“real”) or from the mediated protocol augmented with the simulator (“simulated”). The definition of a strongly hiding protocol is then that regardless of which strategies $(\hat{A}, \hat{P}), \hat{t}, \hat{\rho}_r$ are used, if the mechanism designer follows the playbook in this protocol (hence the “real” run), then no computationally feasible algorithm (distinguisher) can guess with probability nonnegligibly greater than $1/2$ whether it is presented with the transcript of (i.e., messages sent in) the real run or the transcript of a simulation. An *adversary* is a quadruplet $((\hat{A}, \hat{P}), \hat{t}, \hat{\rho}_r, \mathcal{D})$ of mechanism-choosing strategy, joint player strategy, run-bits-choosing

strategy, and distinguisher.⁴

Definition B.1 (Strongly Hiding Protocol). A protocol $((n_c, L_c, \psi_c, n_r, L_r, \psi_r), (\hat{S}_c, \hat{S}_r))$ is *strongly hiding* for a specification $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ and maximum possible running-time gain⁵ B' if there exists a simulator Sim computable in time at most B' such that the following holds. For every adversary⁶ (quadruplet of mechanism-choosing strategy (\hat{A}, \hat{P}) , joint player strategy \hat{t} , run-bits-choosing strategy $\hat{\rho}_r$, and distinguisher \mathcal{D}) computable in time at most B , the following two probabilities are no more than ε apart:

- The probability (over the draw of the simulator's random actions) of the distinguisher \mathcal{D} outputting “real” on input $(\rho'_c, D'_c, t', \rho'_r, x', D'_r)$ corresponding to a simulation with simulator Sim , mechanism-choosing strategy \hat{A}, \hat{P} , joint player strategy \hat{t} , and run-bits-choosing strategy $\hat{\rho}_r$.
- The probability (over uniform drawn commitment bits ρ_c and mechanism-designer bits ρ_d) of the distinguisher \mathcal{D} outputting “real” on input $(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, D_r)$ corresponding to a run of the protocol where the mechanism designer plays the playbook for $\hat{A}(\rho_c), \hat{P}(\rho_c)$, i.e., $D_c = \hat{S}_c(\hat{A}(\rho_c), \hat{P}(\rho_c), \rho_d, \rho_c)$, the players play $t = \hat{t}(\rho_c)$, the run bits are $\rho_r = \hat{\rho}_r(\rho_c)$, and the outcome and run message are $(x, D_r) = \hat{S}_r(A, \rho_d, \rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r)$.

It is not hard to see that a protocol that is strongly hiding for some specification and for any B' is also hiding for the same specification only with a double attack-success probability.

Lemma B.1. *If a protocol is strongly hiding for some specification $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$ and running-time gain B' , then it is hiding for $(L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, 2\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. We prove the counterpositive statement. Assume that there exists a distinguisher program \mathcal{D} that demonstrates that the protocol is not hiding, by distinguishing between two description-proof pairs $(A_1, P_1), (A_2, P_2)$ with probability greater than 2ε . Let Sim be any candidate simulator, with any computational complexity, for exhibiting that the protocol is strongly hiding; we will show that Sim does not satisfy Definition B.1.

⁴Having a deterministic adversary is without loss, since a randomized adversary is a distribution over deterministic ones.

⁵ B' should be thought of as the gain, measured in running time, that an adversary trying to discover a secret mechanism can get by participating. More precisely, this definition formalizes the requirement that (with probability $1 - \varepsilon$) anything an adversary with running time $\tau \leq B$ can learn from this protocol could be learned also by an adversary with running time $\tau + B'$ in the mediated protocol with a (rightfully) trusted third party (where the extra running time of B' can be used to run the simulator).

⁶While the order of quantifiers in our definition of strong hiding is that there exists a single simulator that works for all adversaries, readers may notice that for the above motivation for simulation as capturing why the mechanism is hidden, it would have sufficed to require that for every adversary, there exists a simulator that can be feasibly found by the adversary (more formally, that there exists a feasibly computable map from adversaries to simulators). We impose the stronger requirement of a single simulator that works for all adversaries to avoid unnecessary further clutter in an already symbol-heavy paper (and since it is technically obtainable, see, e.g., Schnorr, 1991; Cramer et al., 1994 for one approach and Canetti et al., 2002 for another).

We first consider the case in which \mathcal{D} demonstrates that the run step is not hiding. When this is the case, there exist $t \in T$ and $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r}$ such if p_1 and p_2 are the probabilities corresponding to (A_1, P_1) and (A_2, P_2) respectively in the definition of when the run step is hiding in Definition 4.3, then $|p_1 - p_2| > 2\varepsilon$. Let $\hat{A}_1 \equiv A_1$, $\hat{P}_1 \equiv P_1$, $\hat{A}_2 \equiv A_2$, $\hat{P}_2 \equiv P_2$, $\hat{t} \equiv t$, and $\hat{\rho}_r \equiv \rho_r$. We note that since $A_1(t, \rho_r) = A_2(t, \rho_r)$, running the mediated protocol with either (A_1, P_1) or (A_2, P_2) results in the exact same messages when players report t and the run bits are ρ_r . Therefore, the first probability in Definition B.1 is the same for $(\hat{A}, \hat{P}) = (\hat{A}_1, \hat{P}_1)$ and for $(\hat{A}, \hat{P}) = (\hat{A}_2, \hat{P}_2)$; denote this probability by p . Since $|p_1 - p_2| > 2\varepsilon$, by the triangle inequality there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $|p_i - p| > \varepsilon$. Therefore, by renaming the output “This is A_1 ” of \mathcal{D} as “real” and all other outputs as “simulated,” we have that the adversary $((\hat{A}_i, \hat{P}_i), \hat{t}, \hat{\rho}_r, \mathcal{D})$ exhibits that *Sim* does not satisfy Definition B.1. We have shown that no simulator satisfies Definition B.1. Thus, the protocol is not strongly hiding, as required.

The case in which \mathcal{D} demonstrates that commitment is not binding is handled similarly, choosing \hat{t} and ρ_r arbitrarily, and distinguishing between transcripts of runs based only on their prefix (ρ_c, D_c) . \square

The above proof works regardless of the value of B' . That is, even if the running-time gain B' is larger by orders of magnitude than the adversary’s running time B , the protocol still satisfies Definition 4.3. This means that a hiding protocol is not guaranteed to not leak information that would otherwise be infeasible for the adversary to compute, but which can be efficiently computed knowing any committed mechanism. To alleviate this concern, when defining what it means for a protocol catalog to be strongly hiding (providing a counterpart to the definition of a hiding protocol catalog in Definition 4.4), we are mindful that the adversary’s running-time gain B' is “mild,” modeled as a subpolynomial function of the adversary’s running time B and the inverse $1/\varepsilon$ of the attack-success probability ε .⁷

Definition B.2 (Strongly Hiding Protocol Catalog). A commit-and-run protocol catalog $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ is *strongly hiding* if there exists a subpolynomial function $Q : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma$, the protocol $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma))$ is strongly hiding for σ and $B' = Q(B, 1/\varepsilon)$.

An immediate consequence of Lemma B.1 is that a protocol catalog that is strongly hiding is also hiding (if the protocols in the catalog are properly renamed to account for the doubling of ε in that lemma). Whenever we must prove throughout this paper that any of

⁷Following Footnote ⁶⁰, we remind readers with background in cryptography that the subpolynomial dependence on B and $1/\varepsilon$ is a reformulation of the standard cryptographic notion of “polynomial in the security parameter.” Here this captures the standard cryptographic security requirement that a simulator run in time polynomial in the security parameter.

our constructed protocol catalogs is hiding, we instead, for added strength, prove that the constructed protocol catalog is strongly hiding.

C Commit-then-Prove Protocols

In this appendix, we define what we call “commit-then-prove” protocols. We both define the security requirements from these protocols and state their existence, which we prove in Appendix F. These protocols provide a general, flexible “one-stop-shop wrapper” around all of the existing cryptographic tools (and definitions) needed in our proofs of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. We hope that their self-contained definition and fairly low barrier for entry might make them appealing also for independent use in other economic theory papers that may wish to avoid the learning curve associated with directly using other cryptographic definitions and tools.

“Commit-then-prove” protocols are protocols for one *prover* and one or more *verifiers*. There are two types of stages in these protocols: In a *commit* stage, the prover irrevocably commits to some secret information w . In a *prove* stage, the prover verifiably posts a claim ϕ about w , i.e., the verifiers are guaranteed that the prover (secretly) knows a proof P such that $\eta(w, \phi, P)$ holds, where η is a commonly known relation that verifies that P is a formal proof of ϕ w.r.t. w . These requirements are formalized by way of emulating an *ideal functionality*, called \mathcal{F}_{CTP} , that captures the expected correctness and secrecy properties (see Fig. A.1). \mathcal{F}_{CTP} is presented in terms of a program to be run by an imaginary “trusted party.” It should be stressed, though, that \mathcal{F}_{CTP} is not meant to be executed by anyone; it is merely part of a mental experiment used to capture the security properties of commit-then-prove protocols.

More formally, a commit-then-prove protocol consists of a set of programs, where each program is parameterized by a *security parameter*. To streamline the use of commit-then-prove protocols in our context, we restrict ourselves to programs whose output length is always the same, and depends only on the security parameter. We call such programs *output-regular*.

Definition C.1 (Commit-then-Prove Protocol). A *commit-then-prove protocol* is a quadruplet of output-regular programs $\pi = (\text{drawrefstring}, \text{commit}, \text{prove}, \text{verify})$, parameterized by a *security parameter* λ . A commit-then-prove protocol π is *secure* for relation η , maximum committed message length n_w , maximum claim length n_ϕ , and maximum proof length n_P if two requirements are met. The first requirement is that there exist:

1. a *parameter translation function* $\tau: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, where $\lambda = \tau(B, \varepsilon)$ is sub-polynomial in B and $1/\varepsilon$;
2. a *simulator program* \mathcal{S} that, given a security parameter λ and a sequence of bits $\rho_{\mathcal{S}} \in \{0, 1\}^{n_{\mathcal{S}}}$ that we think of as an internal source of randomness, generates the

Functionality $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$

$\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ is parameterized by a relation^a $\eta(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$, a prover C , and the following four procedures:^b

- **ChooseCommitmentToken**: takes no arguments, returns a string c to be used as a commitment token.
- **ChooseProofToken**: takes c and ϕ , returns a string p to be used as a proof token.
- **ChooseCommittedMessage**: takes c', ϕ', p' , returns a message w' to be used as a message for commitment c' .
- **ChooseProof**: takes c', ϕ', p' (but NOT w'), return a (valid or invalid proof) P' such that $\eta(w', \phi', P')$ either holds or does not hold.

$\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ proceeds as follows (initially, no records exist):

1. **Commit Phase**: Upon receiving input (Commit, w) from C , where w is a finite sequence of bits, do: If a (Commit) message was previously received, then output (False) to C . Otherwise, let $c \leftarrow \text{ChooseCommitmentToken}()$. If a record of the form (\cdot, c) already exists, then return (abort) . Otherwise, record (w, c) and output $(\text{Commitment}, c)$ to C .
2. **Proof Phase**: Upon receiving input (Prove, ϕ, P) from C , do: If no (Commit) message was received yet, then output (False) to C . Otherwise, let w be what was received as part of the (Commit) message and let c be what was returned. If $\eta(w, \phi, P)$ does not hold, then output (False) to C . Otherwise, let $p \leftarrow \text{ChooseProofToken}(c, \phi)$. Record $(c, \phi, p, \text{True})$ and output (Proof, p) to C .
3. **Proof Validation Phase**: Upon receiving input $(\text{Verify}, c', \phi', p')$ from any party,
 - If a record (c'', ϕ'', p'', x) exists where $(c'', \phi'', p'') = (c', \phi', p')$, then output $(\text{Verified}, x)$.
 - If no record of the form (\cdot, c') exists, choose $w' \leftarrow \text{ChooseCommittedMessage}(c', \phi', p')$ and record (w', c') .
 - Let $P' \leftarrow \text{ChooseProof}(c', \phi', p')$. If $\eta(w', \phi', P')$ holds, then let $x = \text{True}$; otherwise, let $x = \text{False}$. Record (c', ϕ', p', x) , and output $(\text{Verified}, x)$.

^a $\eta(w, \phi, P)$ should be interpreted as “true iff P is a (valid) formal proof that the statement ϕ holds w.r.t. w .” In the context of our paper, for example, if w is a mechanism description and ϕ is a formal statement of the form “the description is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R ,” then $\eta(w, \phi, P)$ is true iff P is a (valid) formal proof that w is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R . As another example, if w is a mechanism description and ϕ is a statement of the form “the described mechanism, when run on type profile t using run bits ρ_r , has outcome x ,” then $\eta(w, \phi, P)$ is true iff P is a (valid) formal proof that w describes a mechanism that when run on type profile t using run bits ρ_r , has outcome x (in this case, P does nothing more than simply trace a run of w).

^bIn the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge, these procedures are constructed by the simulator \mathcal{S} .

Figure A.1: The commit-then-prove functionality. This formulation is a modification of the Commit-and-Prove functionality from Canetti et al. (2002). The main difference is that in Canetti et al. (2002) the prover can deposit secret witnesses adaptively, where each proof can relate to all witnesses deposited so far. For simplicity, here proofs can relate only to the initial witness and the present one (denoted P); hence the name “commit *then* prove.” However, the formulation here additionally mandates non-interactivity, namely that each stage be implemented via a single message generated by the prover. See Appendix F for further details.

following five procedures:

- **SimulateRefString**: takes no arguments, returns a binary string s_{sim} to be used as a simulated reference string (see below). We require that if ρ_S is drawn uniformly at random, then the distribution of s_{sim} is identical to that of the output of $drawrefstring(\lambda)$.
- **ChooseCommitmentToken**, **ChooseProofToken**, **ChooseCommittedMessage**, **ChooseProof**: to be used by \mathcal{F}_{CTP} as described momentarily.

The combined running time of \mathcal{S} and each one of these procedures must be polynomial in λ , in the maximum committed message length n_w , in the maximum claim length n_ϕ , and in the maximum proof length n_P .

To define the second requirement for π to be secure, we first define the following “challenge” for an adversary program \mathcal{A} , which is officiated by an impartial *challenge master*.

The \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -Separation Challenge:

1. The challenge master chooses a bit b uniformly at random.
2. If $b = 0$ then the challenge master runs \mathcal{A} in an interaction with the protocol $\pi = (drawrefstring, commit, prove, verify)$, parameterized by λ . That is:
 - (a) The challenge master samples⁸ a *reference string* $s \leftarrow drawrefstring(\lambda)$ and hands s to \mathcal{A} .
 - (b) \mathcal{A} can repeatedly choose between one of the following three options.
 - i. \mathcal{A} sends **(Commit, w)** to the challenge master. In this case, if a **(Commit)** message was already previously sent to the challenge master, the challenge master outputs **(False)** to \mathcal{A} . Otherwise, the challenge master draws a random string⁹ ρ , computes $(c, \mu) = commit(\lambda, w, \rho, s)$ and hands c to \mathcal{A} . (And remembers the *state* μ .)
 - ii. \mathcal{A} sends **(Prove, ϕ, P)** to the challenge master. In this case, if a **(Commit)** message was never previously sent to the challenge master, the challenge master outputs **(False)** to \mathcal{A} . Otherwise, the challenge master draws a (fresh) random string ρ , computes $(p, \mu') = prove(\lambda, \mu, \phi, P, \rho)$, updates the state $\mu \leftarrow \mu'$, and hands p to \mathcal{A} .
 - iii. \mathcal{A} sends **(Verify, c', ϕ', p')** to the challenge master. In this case, the challenge master hands the value $verify(\lambda, s, c', \phi', p')$ to \mathcal{A} .
3. If $b = 1$ then the challenge master runs \mathcal{A} in an interaction with \mathcal{F}_{CTP}^η (see Fig. A.1) and \mathcal{S} with security parameter λ . That is:

⁸ $drawrefstring$ is a randomized program.

⁹ ρ should be of sufficiently long length, that is, polynomial in all parameters of the problem.

- (a) The challenge master draws $\rho_S \in \{0, 1\}^{n_S}$ uniformly at random, and runs $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\rho_S, \lambda)$ to generate the five procedures `SimulateRefString`, `ChooseCommitmentToken`, `ChooseProofToken`, `ChooseCommittedMessage`, and `ChooseProof`. Next the challenge master invokes an instance of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ parameterized with `ChooseCommitmentToken`, `ChooseProofToken`, `ChooseCommittedMessage`, and `ChooseProof`. Next, the challenge master runs `SimulateRefString` to obtain a simulated reference string s_{sim} , which is handed to \mathcal{A} as a reference string.
- (b) \mathcal{A} can repeatedly choose between one of the following three options: to send `(Commit, w)` to the challenge master, to send `(Prove, ϕ, P)` to the challenge master, or to send `(Verify, c', ϕ', p')` to the challenge master. Either way, the challenge master forwards the message to the instance of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ initiated in the previous step, and hands the returned value to \mathcal{A} .

4. Finally, \mathcal{A} outputs a value b' . We say that \mathcal{A} *wins the challenge* if $b' = b$.

An adversary program \mathcal{A} is said to have *separation advantage*¹⁰ ε if it wins the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge with probability $1/2 + \varepsilon$.

The second requirement for a protocol π to be *secure* is that for every running time bound $B \in \mathbb{N}$ and every separation advantage bound $\varepsilon > 0$, it is the case that every adversary program \mathcal{A} that runs in time at most $B \cdot C_\pi(\lambda)$ —where $\lambda = \tau(B, \varepsilon)$ and $C_\pi(\lambda)$ is the sum of the maximum running times of *commit*, *prove*, and *verify* with security parameter λ —has separation advantage at most ε . Such an adversary \mathcal{A} that has separation advantage greater than ε is said to *break the security* of π .¹¹

Definition C.2 (Perfect Completeness). An adversary \mathcal{A} is called *benign* if in all of its `(Verify, c, ϕ, p)` messages the value c is the value returned by the challenge master in response to an earlier `(commit, w)` message, and the value p is the value returned by the challenge master in response to an earlier `(prove, ϕ, P)` message. A commit-then-prove protocol has *perfect completeness* if there exists a simulator \mathcal{S}_B such that all benign adversaries have separation advantage $\varepsilon = 0$ in the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge with respect to \mathcal{S}_B . (That is, a benign adversary’s view in the corresponding \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge is statistically independent from the bit b .)

Definition C.3 (Uniform Reference String). A commit-then-prove protocol $\pi = (\text{drawrefstring}, \text{commit}, \text{prove})$

¹⁰Advantage over simply uniformly guessing, that is.

¹¹The requirement that π is a secure commit-then-prove protocol is a restatement, with three additions discussed in Appendix F, of the requirement that π UC-realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ as in Canetti (2020), which we managed to simplify by avoiding the definition of the UC execution framework in its full generality before specializing it for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$.

is said to have a *uniform reference string* if *drawrefstring* simply draws a uniform random string of some predefined length (that may depend on λ).

Definition C.4 (Feasible Computation). A commit-then-prove protocol $\pi = (\text{drawrefstring}, \text{commit}, \text{prove}, \text{verify})$ is called *feasibly computable* if:

- The running time of *drawrefstring* is polynomial in the security parameter λ .
- The running time of *commit* is polynomial in the maximum message length n_w and the security parameter λ .
- The running time of *prove* and of *verify* is polynomial in the maximum message length n_w , the maximum claim length n_ϕ , the maximum proof length n_P , the running time of η , and the security parameter λ .


Definition C.5 (Succinctness). A commit-then-prove protocol π is called *succinct* if it is feasibly computable, and in addition, the running time of *verify* is polylogarithmic rather than polynomial in the maximum message length n_w , the maximum proof length n_P , and the running time of η .

Note that succinctness implies that the size of the output of *commit* is polylogarithmic rather than polynomial in the maximum committed message length n_w , and that the size of the output of *prove* is polylogarithmic rather than polynomial in the maximum proof length n_P and the running time of η .

We now state the main results of this appendix, which assert the existence of commit-then-prove protocols with all of the above properties under suitable computational infeasibility assumptions.

Theorem C.1. *Under standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumptions, there exist feasibly computable secure commit-then-prove protocols with perfect completeness and uniform reference string for any polytime-computable relation η .*

Theorem C.2. *In the random oracle model, there exist succinct secure commit-then-prove protocols with perfect completeness and uniform reference string for any polytime-computable relation η .*

See Appendix F for the proofs of these two theorems. We note that these proofs are constructive. That is, each of these proofs provides an algorithmic way for transforming any adversary that breaks the security of the commit-then-prove protocol into an adversary that breaks the security of one of the underlying standard computational infeasibility assumptions (or, for Theorem C.2, the security of the hash function that was modeled as a random oracle in the analysis).

D Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 via Commit-then-Prove Protocols

In this appendix, we prove Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 using the machinery introduced in Appendix C, constructing the commit-and-run protocol catalogs guaranteed to exist by these theorems. For convenience, we restate the theorems before proving them. In fact, we restate a stronger variant of each theorem, which guarantees strong hiding (Definition B.1) rather than only hiding (Definition 4.3); each of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 then follows from its stronger variant by Lemma B.1.

Theorem D.1. *Under standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumptions, there exists a strongly hiding, committing, implementing, and feasibly computable direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol catalog.*

Proof of Theorem D.1 (and of Theorem 4.1). Recall that a specification determines the length of various strings and the security requirements. A specification is given as some sextuplet $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon)$ where:

- L_a is an upper bound on the description length of a mechanism,
- n_r is an upper bound on the number of run bits needed by a mechanism
- R is an upper bound on the running time of a mechanism description.
- L_p is an upper bound on the length of a proof that a description is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R ,
- B is an upper bound on the running time of an adversary (mechanism designer who attempts to break her commitment, or players attempting to discover a secret mechanism), and,
- $\varepsilon > 0$ is an upper bound on the attack-success probability of an adversary.

To prove Theorem D.1, we construct a commit-and-run protocol for each specification σ . Recall that to construct this protocol, we need to define:

- n_c^σ — number of public random bits used in the commitment stage,
- L_c^σ — length of a commitment message,
- ψ_c^σ — commitment verifier: algorithm for verifying the validity of a commitment,
- n_r^σ — number of run bits,
- L_r^σ — length of a run message,
- ψ_r^σ — run verifier: algorithm for verifying the proper running of a hidden mechanism,
- and,

- $(\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma)$ — playbook recommending mechanism designer strategies for the commitment and run stages.

We first define a commit-then-prove instance $\pi^\sigma = (\text{drawrefstring}, \text{commit}, \text{prove}, \text{verify})$ that realizes the commit-then-prove functionality from Definition C.1, and then use this instance to define the commit-and-run protocol. We use a commit-then-prove instance guaranteed by Theorem C.1.

Defining an appropriate commit-then-prove instance. We define the parameters for the commit-then-prove instance π^σ using the specification $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon)$ as follows:

- $\eta(A, \phi, P)$ is the relation “ P is a (valid) proof that statement ϕ holds for A .”
- Set $n_w \leftarrow L_a$.
- Set $n_p \leftarrow \max\{L_p, R\}$.
- Set $n_\phi \leftarrow$ maximum length of any formal statement that formalizes a statement of one of the following two forms:
 - “This is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R .”
 - “This description, when run on type profile t using run bits ρ_r , has outcome x .”
- Set $\lambda \leftarrow \tau(3 \cdot |T| \cdot 2^{n_r} \cdot B + R, \varepsilon/2)$.

Defining the grammar rules. We define the grammar rules for the commit-and-run protocol using the specification $\sigma = (L_a, n_r, R, L_p, B, \varepsilon)$ and the instance $\pi^\sigma = (\text{drawrefstring}, \text{commit}, \text{prove}, \text{verify})$ as follows:

- n_c^σ — number of bits returned by a call to *drawrefstring*.
- L_c^σ — sum of number of bits returned by *commit* and number of bits returned by *prove*. We henceforth use the notation $D_c = (C, p_c)$.
- $\psi_c^\sigma(\rho_c, D_c) = \psi_c^\sigma(\rho_c, (C, p_c))$ is computed by running *verify* $(\lambda, \rho_c, C, \phi_c, p_c)$, where ϕ_c is the formal statement that formalizes the statement “this is a valid description of a mechanism that is IR and DSIC, uses at most n_r run bits, and runs in time at most R .”
- $(n_r^\sigma$ is copied from σ .)
- L_r^σ — number of bits returned by *prove*.
- $\psi_r^\sigma(\rho_c, D_c, t, \rho_r, x, p_r) = \psi_r^\sigma(\rho_c, (C, p_c), t, \rho_r, x, p_r)$ is computed by running *verify* $(\lambda, \rho_c, C, \phi_r(t, \rho_r, x), p_r)$, where $\phi_r(t, \rho_r, x)$ is the formal statement that formalizes the statement “this description, when run on type profile t using run bits ρ_r , has outcome x .”

Defining the playbook. We define the playbook $(\hat{S}_c^\sigma, \hat{S}_r^\sigma)$ as follows:

- The number of mechanism designer private random bits n_d is the sum the number of random bits needed by a single call to *commit* and twice the number of random bits needed by a single call to *prove*. We henceforth use the notation $\rho_d = (\rho_d^1, \rho_d^2, \rho_d^3)$ where ρ_d^1 is of the length needed by *commit* while ρ_d^2 and ρ_d^3 are of the length needed by *prove*.
- Commitment strategy for mechanism designer with mechanism description A and (valid) proof P that A satisfies ϕ_c :
 - Compute $(C, \mu) \leftarrow \text{commit}(\lambda, A, \rho_d^1, \rho_c)$.
 - Compute $p_c \leftarrow \text{prove}(\lambda, \mu, \phi_c, P, \rho_d^2)$.
 - Send the commitment message $D_c \leftarrow (C, p_c)$.
- Run strategy for mechanism designer with mechanism description A :
 - Compute $x \leftarrow M_A(t, \rho_r)$.
 - Let P_r be a (valid) proof that A satisfies $\phi_r(t, \rho_r, x)$ (i.e., a proof that follows the steps of the calculation of $M_A(t, \rho_r)$ and proves that each step is correct).
 - Compute $p_r \leftarrow \text{prove}(\lambda, \mu, \phi_r(t, \rho_r, x), P_r, \rho_d^3)$.
 - Send the outcome x as well as the run message $D_r \leftarrow p_r$.

Properties of the protocol catalog. We have concluded the definition of our protocol for each specification σ . It remains to show that the resulting protocol catalog $((n_c^\sigma, L_c^\sigma, \psi_c^\sigma, n_r^\sigma, L_r^\sigma, \psi_r^\sigma), (\mathcal{S}_B^\sigma, \mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\sigma))$ is implementing, committing, strongly hiding (and thus, by Lemma B.1, hiding), and feasibly computable.

Feasible Computation. The catalog is feasibly computable (Definition 4.5) because π is feasibly computable by Theorem C.1.

Implementation. To prove that the catalog is implementing (Definition 4.1), note that since the playbook by definition calculates the outcome $M_A(t, \rho_r)$, it suffices to prove that verifications are always successful when the mechanism designer follows the playbook. This is due to π having perfect completeness. Indeed, by Definition C.2 there exists a simulator \mathcal{S}_B such that the separation advantage of every benign adversary \mathcal{A} is $\varepsilon = 0$, i.e., the view of \mathcal{A} in the corresponding \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge is statistically independent from the bit b .

Assume for contradiction that for some specification σ , verifications would not pass for some A , P , ρ_d , ρ_c , t , and ρ_r . Construct a benign adversary \mathcal{A} for the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge as follows. \mathcal{A} simply runs our commit-and-run protocol, playing the roles of both the mechanism designer (using the playbook) and the players according to A , P , ρ_d , t , and ρ_r , replacing calls to *commit*, *prove*, and *verify* with respective messages to the challenge master. \mathcal{A} outputs $b' = 1$ if verifications pass, and $b' = 0$ if any verification fails.

The running time of \mathcal{A} is at most $R + 2C_\pi(\lambda)$ (where $C_\pi(\lambda)$ is defined as in Definition C.1). We thus obtain a contradiction by observing that this benign adversary has positive separa-

tion advantage. Indeed, note that when $b=1$ (interacting with \mathcal{S}_B), verifications always pass, while when $b=0$ (interacting with π), by our assumption they fail with positive probability.

Committing. To prove that the catalog is committing (Definition 4.2), for every specification σ , mechanism designer strategy (S_c, S_r) computable in time at most B , and $\rho_d \in \{0,1\}^{n_d}$, it suffices to show that there exists a (not necessarily feasibly computable¹²) function E (which we call a *mechanism extractor*) from sequences of n_c bits to descriptions of mechanisms that are IR and DSIC, use at most n_r run bits, and run in time at most R , such that: With probability at least $1-\varepsilon$ over $\rho_c \in U(\{0,1\}^{n_c})$, for every $t \in T$ and $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r}$, if both commitment and run verifications succeed, then the mechanism that was run is $M_{E(\rho_c)}$. That is:

$$\Pr_{\rho_c \in U(\{0,1\}^{n_c})} \left[\exists t \in T, \rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r} \text{ s.t. } S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)_{\text{outcome}} \neq M_{E(\rho_c)}(t, \rho_r) \ \& \right. \\ \left. \& \ \psi_c(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c)) \ \& \ \psi_r(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r, S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)) \right] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (1)$$

To define the mechanism extractor E , we first define a whole set of possible mechanism extractors, and show that when an extractor is drawn uniformly at random from this set, its expected error (over both drawing it and drawing ρ_c) is small; from this, we will deduce that there exists some extractor in that set for which the expected error (over drawing ρ_c) is small, as required.

The extractors in the set are parametrized by a linear order Π over $\{0,1\}^{n_S}$ (where n_S is as defined in Definition C.1), to be chosen later in this proof. $E_\Pi(\rho_c)$ is defined as follows (recall that the mechanism extractor need not necessarily be feasibly computable), using the simulator \mathcal{S} that exists for π by Definition C.1.

1. Let $(c, p_c) = S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c)$.
2. Let $\rho_S \in \{0,1\}^{n_S}$ be the Π -first sequence such that the function **SimulateRefString** constructed by $\mathcal{S}(\rho_S, \lambda)$ chooses ρ_c as the simulated reference string. Initialize $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\rho_S, \lambda)$.
3. Recall that the simulator \mathcal{S} , together with constructing the procedure **SimulateRefString** that chooses the simulated reference string (which is here used as ρ_c), constructs four procedures, including **ChooseCommittedMessage** and **ChooseProof**; run **ChooseCommittedMessage** with inputs c , ϕ_c , and p_c , and denote its output by A .
4. Run **ChooseProof** with inputs c , ϕ_c , and p_c , and denote its output by P .

¹²Recall that our notion of extraction differs from the standard cryptographic notion of extractability, which requires the ability to feasibly approximately sample pairs (ρ_c, A) . We have chosen our notion to maximize economic usability. We nonetheless note that the constructions in this paper satisfy both notions.

5. If $\eta(A, \phi_c, P)$ holds, then return A ; otherwise return an arbitrary IR and DSIC mechanism.

We first note that by definition of η and of ϕ_c , any mechanism returned by E_Π , for any $\Pi \in \{0,1\}^{ns}$ (i.e., for any linear order Π over $\{0,1\}^{ns}$) is IR and DSIC. We claim that:

$$\Pr_{\substack{\rho_c \in U(\{0,1\}^{nc}), \\ \Pi \in U(\{0,1\}^{ns})}} \left[\exists t \in T, \rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{nr} \text{ s.t. } \right. \\ \left. S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)_{\text{outcome}} \neq M_{E_\Pi(\rho_c)}(t, \rho_r) \ \& \ \right. \\ \left. \& \ \psi_c(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c)) \ \& \ \psi_r(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r, S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)) \right] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

Let q be the probability on the left-hand side of Eq. (2). To prove that $q \leq \varepsilon$ as claimed, we construct an adversary \mathcal{A} for the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge as follows:

- Run our commit-and-run protocol with the reference string of the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge as ρ_c , until the end of the commitment verification step, using the commitment strategy S_c . In addition to the call to *verify* from ψ_c , also send a respective message to the challenge master.
- Iterate over every $t \in T$ and $\rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{nr}$. For each such t and ρ_r , continue to run our commit-and-run protocol (with the reference string of the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge as ρ_c), starting after the commitment verification step, using the run strategy S_r , with player reports t and run bits ρ_r . Whenever there is a call to *verify*, in addition to this call, also send a respective message to the challenge master.
- If the commitment verification succeeds (i.e., running ψ_c returns **True**) and in addition, in any of the iterations, the run verification succeeds (i.e., running ψ_r returns **True**) and yet the challenge master returned **False** for either the (**Verify**) message of that iteration or the commitment-verification (**Verify**) message, then output $b' = 1$. Otherwise, output $b' = 0$.

The running time of \mathcal{A} is at most $(1 + |T| \cdot 2^{nr}) \cdot (B + C_\pi(\lambda))$ (where $C_\pi(\lambda)$ is defined as in Definition C.1). Therefore, by the guarantee in Definition C.1, its separation advantage is at most $\varepsilon/2$.

Note that ρ_S used by the mechanism extractor in Eq. (2) is distributed uniformly at random in $\{0,1\}^{ns}$ (since **SimulateRefString** chooses the reference string uniformly at random if ρ_S is chosen uniformly at random), just like in the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge. This creates a natural coupling between the probability spaces in Eq. (2) and in the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge when the interaction is with $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ and \mathcal{S} (i.e., when $b = 1$). Note that \mathcal{A} never sends any (**Commit**) or (**Prove**) messages to the challenge master. Therefore, if \mathcal{A} is run in an interaction with $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$ and \mathcal{S} (i.e., if $b = 1$), upon receipt of the commitment-verification (**Verify**) message, \mathcal{F}_{CTP} runs **ChooseCommittedMessage** with inputs c , ϕ_c , and p_c to obtain

a (valid or invalid) description A , and **ChooseProof** with inputs c , ϕ_c , and p_c to obtain a (valid or invalid) proof P , and returns **True** only if $\eta(A, \phi_c, P)$ holds; moreover, upon receipt of any of the run-verification (**Verify**) messages, \mathcal{F}_{CTP} returns **True** only if $\eta(A, \phi_r(t, \rho_r, x), P_r)$ (with t , ρ_r of that iteration, where x is the outcome of that iteration) holds for some P_r . Therefore, the condition under which \mathcal{A} outputs $b' = 1$ holds whenever the event whose probability is (allegedly) bounded by Eq. (2) holds. On the other hand, if \mathcal{A} is run in interaction with π (i.e., $b = 0$) then if any verification succeeds, then the challenge master returns **True** for the corresponding (**Verify**) message, and so the condition under which \mathcal{A} outputs $b' = 1$ never holds. To sum up, with probability at least q over the draw of ρ_S , we have that \mathcal{A} wins the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge. Otherwise \mathcal{A} wins with probability $1/2$. Overall, \mathcal{A} wins with probability at least $q \cdot 1 + (1 - q) \cdot 1/2 = 1/2 + q/2$, i.e., has separation advantage at least $q/2$. Hence, $q \leq \varepsilon$, as claimed.¹³

To complete the proof that the catalog is committing, note that Eq. (2) can be rewritten as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Pi \in U(\{0,1\}^{n_S})} \left[\Pr_{\rho_c \in U(\{0,1\}^{n_c})} \left[\exists t \in T, \rho_r \in \{0,1\}^{n_r} \text{ s.t. } \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)_{\text{outcome}} \neq M_{E_{\Pi}(\rho_c)}(t, \rho_r) \ \& \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \& \psi_c(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c)) \ \& \psi_r(\rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r, S_r(\rho_d, \rho_c, S_c(\rho_d, \rho_c), t, \rho_r)) \right] \right] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3)$$

Therefore, there exists $\Pi \in \{0,1\}^{n_S}$ such that probability that is inside the expectation in Eq. (3) is at most ε . Thus, for this value of Π , we have that E_{Π} satisfies Eq. (1), as required.

Strong Hiding. To prove that the catalog is strongly hiding (Definition B.1; recall that by Lemma B.1, this implies that it is also hiding as defined in Definition 4.3), for every B and ε we first define $Q(B, 1/\varepsilon)$ (see Definition B.2) to be the running time of the simulator \mathcal{S} that exists for π by Definition C.1, when run with λ as chosen above, plus the running time of once running each of the procedures **SimulateRefString** and **ChooseCommitmentToken** that it defines and twice running the procedure **ChooseProofToken** that it defines. Note that Q is indeed a subpolynomial function since τ is subpolynomial in B and in $1/\varepsilon$ and since the combined running time of \mathcal{S} and these procedures is polynomial in λ . We now prove that for every specification σ , the protocol is strongly hiding for $B' = Q(B, 1/\varepsilon)$, by defining a simulator Sim for the commit-and-run protocol. To define this simulator, we have to define how it chooses commitment random bits ρ'_c , and how it chooses (without knowing \hat{A} , \hat{P} , \hat{t} , or $\hat{\rho}_r$) a commitment message D'_c and a run message D'_r . We define this simulator using \mathcal{S} (the

¹³Recall that otherwise, \mathcal{A} breaks the security of π , and hence can be feasibly transformed into an adversary that breaks the security of the underlying standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumption.

simulator for π). The simulator Sim for the commit-and-run protocol draws $\rho_S \in \{0,1\}^{ns}$ uniformly at random, initializes $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\rho_S, \lambda)$, and chooses ρ'_c by setting it to be the simulated reference string chosen by `SimulateRefString`. Sim chooses D'_c as follows:

1. Run `ChooseCommitmentToken`; denote its output by c .
2. Run `ChooseProofToken` with inputs c and ϕ_c ; denote its output by p_c .
3. Set $D'_c = (c, p_c)$.

Sim chooses D'_r by running `ChooseProofToken` with inputs c and $\phi_r(t', \rho'_r, x')$ and setting D'_r to be its output.

The running time of Sim is at most $Q(B, 1/\varepsilon)$. Assume for contradiction that there exists an adversary $((\hat{A}, \hat{P}), \hat{t}, \hat{\rho}_r, \mathcal{D})$ (quadruplet of mechanism-choosing strategy, joint player strategy, run-bits-choosing strategy, and distinguisher), computable in time at most B , for the commit-and-run protocol and Sim , such that the two probabilities in Definition B.1 are more than ε apart; w.l.o.g. assume that the second probability is higher (otherwise switch the two outputs of the distinguisher \mathcal{D}). We construct an adversary \mathcal{A} for the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -separation challenge as follows. \mathcal{A} simply runs our commit-and-run protocol, without any of the verification steps, playing the roles of both the mechanism designer (using the playbook) and the players according to $\hat{A}(\rho_c)$, $\hat{P}(\rho_c)$, a uniformly drawn ρ_d , $t = \hat{t}(\rho_c)$, and $\rho_r = \hat{\rho}_r(\rho_c)$, where ρ_c is taken to equal the reference string, replacing calls to *commit* and *prove* (no calls to *verify* occur as no verification steps are run) with respective messages to the challenge master. \mathcal{A} then runs \mathcal{D} on the resulting transcript, outputting $b' = 0$ if \mathcal{D} outputs “real” and outputting $b' = 1$ if \mathcal{D} outputs “simulated.”

The running time of \mathcal{A} is at most $R + 2C_\pi(\lambda) + B$ (where $C_\pi(\lambda)$ is defined as in Definition C.1). We obtain a contradiction by observing that \mathcal{A} has separation advantage greater than $\varepsilon/2$.¹⁴ By construction of Sim and \mathcal{A} , the two probabilities from Definition B.1 respectively correspond to the probability $P(b' = 0 | b = 1)$ of outputting $b' = 0$ when truly $b = 1$ and the probability $P(b' = 0 | b = 0)$ of outputting $b' = 0$ when truly $b = 0$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{A} \text{ wins}) &= P(b' = 0 \ \& \ b = 0) + P(b' = 1 \ \& \ b = 1) = \\
&= P(b' = 0 | b = 0) \cdot 1/2 + (1 - P(b' = 0 | b = 1)) \cdot 1/2 = \\
&= 1/2 + 1/2 \cdot (P(b' = 0 | b = 0) - P(b' = 0 | b = 1)) > 1/2 + \varepsilon/2. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem D.2. *In the random oracle model, there exists a strongly hiding, committing, implementing, feasibly computable, and succinct direct-revelation commit-and-run protocol*

¹⁴Recall that this would mean that \mathcal{A} breaks the security of π , and hence can be feasibly transformed into an adversary that breaks the security of the underlying standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumption.

catalog.

Proof of Theorem D.2 (and of Theorem 4.2). The proof is the same as that of Theorem D.1, with the change that instead of using a commit-then-prove instance guaranteed by Theorem C.1, we use a commit-then-prove instance guaranteed by Theorem C.2. Then, the catalog is feasibly computable (Definition 4.5) and succinct (Definition 4.6) because π is succinct by Theorem C.2. \square

E Illustrative Example 5: Simple Secure Multiparty Computation of Single-Item Pricing

In this appendix, we return to the simple setting of Illustrative Example 1 from Section 2—that of a seller offering an item to a buyer for some price—and present a simple rudimentary construction that allows to calculate the outcome while hiding both the price $s \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$ and the buyer’s reported value $v \in \{0, \dots, H-1\}$, as suggested in Section 5.3. Specifically, the buyer should learn nothing about s before sending her final message, and the seller should learn nothing about v before learning the outcome, which happens upon receiving the buyer’s final message; if trade takes place, then the buyer should learn s but the seller should learn nothing about v beyond the fact that $v \geq s$ (which is implied by trade); and if trade does not take place, then neither the buyer nor the seller should learn more beyond the fact that $v < s$ (which is implied by no trade). The buyer should, as always, be convinced that there really is a commitment here, i.e., that the seller has no way to alter the (hidden) price after she has set it. While formalizing the precise guarantees that our construction for this example affords is beyond the scope of this paper, we hope that it does give some intuition into how it is even possible to perform a calculation in which no party, even in retrospect, might learn all of the information.

We will continue to use the commitment scheme introduced in Illustrative Example 1 from Section 2. The seller starts by sending to the buyer a commitment to H bits $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{H-1}$, where $\sigma_s = 1$, and $\sigma_i = 0$ for every $i \neq s$. Let $C_i = f^{\rho_i}$ be the commitment to σ_i (where the value of $f \in \{g, h\}$ depends on the value of σ_i). The seller then proves in zero-knowledge to the buyer that she knows the logarithm base g of all but one of these values (and the logarithm base h of one of these values, if we do not wish to allow the seller’s commitment to not allow sale at even $H-1$); this can be done using our new generalized procedure from Appendix A.1.3.

Now, the buyer sends to the seller a commitment to H bits $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{H-1}$, where $\beta_i = 1$ if the buyer is willing to buy at price i , and $\beta_i = 0$ otherwise. Let $K_i = f^{\rho'_i}$ be the commitment to β_i (where the value of $f \in \{g, h\}$ depends on the value of β_i). The buyer furthermore

sends to the seller H values Z_0, \dots, Z_{H-1} , where $Z_i = C_i^{\rho'_i}$ for every i such that $\beta_i = 1$, and Z_i is uniformly drawn from G otherwise.¹⁵

Finally, the seller checks whether $Z_s = K_s^{\rho_s}$. If so, then the seller reveals ρ_s to the buyer and trade takes place at price s . Otherwise, trade does not take place.

F Proofs for Appendix C

In this appendix, we provide an overview of the main components in the construction and analysis of commit-then-prove protocols, substantiating Theorems C.1 and C.2 from Appendix C. To keep the number of pages manageable, this appendix (and only this appendix) is written to an audience with background in cryptography.

Recall that a commit-then-prove protocol π for some publicly known relation η allows a committer to commit to a secret string w , and later provide, over time, public statements ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots , where each ϕ_i is accompanied by a proof that the committer knows some secret supporting information P_i such that $\eta(w, \phi_i, P_i)$ holds. This is done while preserving the secrecy of w and of the P_i s, in the sense that interacting with the committer provides the participants with no additional information or computational advantage beyond what can be inferred from the statements ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots themselves. Furthermore, both the commitment stage and each proof stage consists of a single message generated by the committer.

More specifically, a protocol π is a commit-then-prove protocol for relation η if π UC-realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{CTP}}^\eta$, with the following additional properties. (1) Perfect completeness: when the committer follows the protocol, the verifier is guaranteed to always accept. (2) The only common state of the committer and the verifier programs is a uniformly distributed reference string. Furthermore, the simulated reference string is also distributed uniformly. (This provision is later used to guarantee our analogue of soundness—i.e., what we call *committing*—in the commit-and-run protocols for each value of the reference string, except perhaps for a negligible fraction.)¹⁶

We also note that \mathcal{F}_{CTP} is similar to the commit-and-prove functionality from Canetti et al. (2002), with the following exceptions:

¹⁵One may wonder about consistency proofs for the buyer's messages. We note that effectively, the buyer only agrees to buy at a certain price i if there exists ρ'_i such that both $K_i = g^{\rho'_i}$ and $Z_i = C_i^{\rho'_i}$. The buyer is incentivized to construct the messages as described, to indicate agreement to buy at each price i if and only if $i \leq v$. For simplicity, we therefore avoid consistency proofs for buyer messages.

¹⁶The UC framework allows the simulator to generate a reference string that is distributed differently than prescribed by the protocol, as long as this fact remain unnoticed by the adversary. In contrast, the \mathcal{F}_{CTP} -challenge of Definition C.1 is a direct restatement of the requirement that the protocol in question UC-realizes \mathcal{F}_{CTP} with the aid of a common uniform string—with the exception that Definition C.1 restricts attention to simulators that generate a reference string that is uniformly distributed.

1. In Canetti et al. (2002), the committer can commit, over time, to multiple secret values w_1, w_2, \dots , and then prove that each public statement ϕ_i satisfies $\eta(\phi_i, w_1, w_2, \dots)$ with respect to multiple committed values. This also obviates the need to have explicit supporting information P_1, P_2, \dots .
2. In Canetti et al. (2002) each commitment and proof stage is allowed to be interactive, while \mathcal{F}_{CTP} requires non-interactivity.
3. In the case of Theorem C.2, the work done by the verifier algorithm should be polylogarithmic in $|w|$, as well as in $|P_i|$ and the running time of $\eta(w, \phi_i, P_i)$ for all i . (This of course also means that the commitment and proof strings should be succinct as well.)

Constructions of commit-then-prove protocols in this work will thus follow a similar structure to those in Canetti et al. (2002), while replacing components so as to satisfy the additional requirements. Recall that in Canetti et al. (2002) the commitment stage can be realized via any protocol that UC-realizes \mathcal{F}_{COM} , the ideal commitment functionality, whereas each proof stage can be realized via any protocol that UC-realizes \mathcal{F}_{ZK} , the zero-knowledge proof functionality. In particular, the UC commitment protocols and zero-knowledge proofs from Canetti and Fischlin (2001) work.

In the case of commit-then-prove protocols we use a similar strategy, except that here we replace \mathcal{F}_{COM} and \mathcal{F}_{ZK} by their non-interactive variants $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ (see, e.g., Canetti et al., 2022), which provide the additional guarantee that the commit and prove stages are each realized via a single message.¹⁷

It thus remains to show how to appropriately realize $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$. For Theorem C.1 we first show protocols that realize $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ with a common uniformly random string. As demonstrated in Canetti et al. (2022), the Canetti and Fischlin (2001) commitment protocol UC-realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$, provided a public-key encryption scheme that is secure against chosen-ciphertext attacks and a claw-free pair of permutations. The reference string is then interpreted as a pair (e, c) where e is a public key for the encryption scheme and c is a key of the claw-free pair. Both primitives have instantiations based on standard, widely believed computational infeasibility assumptions and where the relevant keys are uniformly drawn. The protocol of Groth et al. (2012) UC-realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ with a uniformly chosen reference string, under similar computational infeasibility assumptions. We further note that: (1) the simulators in both Canetti and Fischlin (2001) and Groth et al. (2012) indeed use a reference string that is distributed identically to the one used in the respective protocols, and, (2) both protocols enjoy perfect completeness: as long as the parties follow the protocol,

¹⁷The proof that the combination of a protocol that realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ and a protocol that realizes $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ actually realizes \mathcal{F}_{CTP} is the same as in Canetti et al. (2002). In fact, the non-interactivity guarantees of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ allow simplifying the proof considerably. We omit further details.

the verifier always accepts. (It is stressed that these instantiations are only given by way of “proof of concept”; multiple other instantiations exist, offering a rich ground for trading among various complexity parameters and computational infeasibility assumptions.)

For Theorem C.2, namely to guarantee succinctness, we resort to protocols analyzed in the random oracle model, namely by protocols that employ a cryptographic hash function that is modeled, for sake of analysis, as a random function. Specifically, such an idealized hash function is modeled via the random oracle functionality \mathcal{F}_{RO} . Succinct protocols for realizing $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NICOM}}$ with access to \mathcal{F}_{RO} are described e.g. in Hofheinz and Müller-Quade (2004). Succinct protocols for realizing $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NIZK}}$ with access to \mathcal{F}_{RO} are described, e.g., in Ganesh et al. (2022). Also here, both protocols enjoy perfect completeness: as long as the parties follow the protocol, the verifier always accepts.¹⁸

In terms of concrete infeasibility assumptions, we recall that non interactive UC commitments and Zero Knowledge can be realized from any number of computational infeasibility assumptions that are standard and widely believed in cryptography, for instance the RSA assumption, The Learning With Errors assumption, the Decisional Diffie–Hellman assumption together with the Learning Parity with Noise assumption, the Bilinear Decisional Diffie–Hellman assumption (see, e.g., Canetti and Fischlin, 2001; Canetti et al., 2002; Groth et al., 2012; Brakerski et al., 2020; Canetti et al., 2022).

References for Appendices

- Z. Brakerski, V. Koppula, and T. Mour. Nizk from lpn and trapdoor hash via correlation intractability for approximable relations. In D. Micciancio and T. Ristenpart, editors, *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO 2020 Proceedings*, pages 738–767, 2020.
- R. Canetti. Universally composable security. *Journal of the ACM*, 67(5):28:1–28:94, 2020.
- R. Canetti and M. Fischlin. Universally composable commitments. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO 2001 Proceedings*, pages 19–40, 2001.
- R. Canetti, Y. Lindell, R. Ostrovsky, and A. Sahai. Universally composable two-party and multi-party secure computation. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 494–503, 2002.
- R. Canetti, P. Sarkar, and X. Wang. Triply adaptive uc nizk. In *Advances in Cryptology — ASIACRYPT 2022 Proceedings*, pages 466–495, 2022.
- R. Cramer, I. Damgård, and B. Schoenmakers. Proofs of partial knowledge and simplified design of witness hiding protocols. In Y. Desmedt, editor, *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO ’94 Proceedings*, pages 174–187, 1994.

¹⁸Strictly speaking, these protocols do not employ an explicit reference string, since \mathcal{F}_{RO} provides a sufficient source of common randomness. Still, also here, the distribution of \mathcal{F}_{RO} remains unchanged in the simulation, so everything goes through.

- A. Fiat and A. Shamir. How to prove yourself: Practical solutions to identification and signature problems. In *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO '86 Proceedings*, pages 186–194, 1986.
- C. Ganesh, Y. Kondi, C. Orlandi, M. Pancholi, A. Takahashi, and D. Tschudi. Witness-succinct universally-composable snarks. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2022/1618, 2022.
- J. Groth, R. Ostrovsky, and A. Sahai. New techniques for noninteractive zero-knowledge. *Journal of the ACM*, 59(3), 2012.
- D. Hofheinz and J. Müller-Quade. Universally composable commitments using random oracles. In *Proceedings of TCC*, pages 58–76, 2004.
- C. Schnorr. Efficient signature generation by smart cards. *Journal of Cryptology*, 4(3):161–174, 1991.