

Labeled Delegated PSI and its Applications in the Public Sector

Kristof Verslype
Smals Research
Brussels, Belgium
kristof.verslype@smals.be

Florian Kerschbaum
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada
florian.kerschbaum@uwaterloo.ca

Cyprien Delpech de Saint
Guilhem
Cosic - KU Leuven, 3MI Labs
Leuven, Belgium
cyprien.delpechdesaintguilhem@kuleuven.be

Bart De Decker
DistriNet - KU Leuven
Leuven, Belgium
bart.dedecker@cs.kuleuven.be

Jorn Lapon
DistriNet - KU Leuven
Gent, Belgium
jorn.lapon@kuleuven.be

Abstract

Sensitive citizen data, such as social, medical, and fiscal data, is heavily fragmented across public bodies and the private domain. Mining the combined data sets allows for new insights that otherwise remain hidden. Examples are improved healthcare, fraud detection, and evidence-based policy making. (Multi-party) delegated private set intersection (D-PSI) is a privacy-enhancing technology to link data across multiple data providers using a data collector. However, before it can be deployed in these use cases, it needs to be enhanced with additional functions, e.g., securely delivering payload only for elements in the intersection. Although there has been recent progress in the communication and computation requirements of D-PSI, these practical obstacles have not yet been addressed.

This paper is the result of a collaboration with a governmental organization responsible for collecting, linking, and pseudonymizing data. Based on their requirements, we design a new D-PSI protocol with composable output functions, including encrypted payload and pseudonymized identifiers. We show that our protocol is secure in the standard model against colluding semi-honest *data providers* and against a non-colluding, possibly malicious independent party, the *data collector*. It, hence, allows to privately link and collect data from multiple data providers suitable for deployment in these use cases in the public sector.

Keywords

Labeled, Delegated, Private Set Intersection, Privacy

1 Introduction

Data is very often fragmented across government agencies and commercial entities. However, linking this data is usually challenging, as the data may contain sensitive, personally identifiable information (PII), making it extra difficult to meticulously respect the privacy regulations.

As an example, an academic researcher investigates whether citizens, with a yearly salary above €50.000, who are self-employed as a secondary occupation and were born in 1990 or later, are sufficiently insured in their capacity of a self-employed person against certain occupational diseases. Therefore, the researcher is interested in non-aggregated – i.e. non-summarized – pseudonymized data about this subgroup of people. However, fiscal, employment, and insurance data are managed by separate organizations (data providers). Hence, this basic query already involves at least three

data providers, that are unable to select the relevant records on their own.

In practice, for privacy reasons, existing solutions turn to a combination of trusted parties and strong legal regulations about the collection, linking and pseudonymization of the data, before data can be used for analysis. Examples of parties trusted to perform data linking are the Census Bureau in the US, the Research Data Centers (RDCs) in Germany, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) in France and the Federal Statistical Office in Switzerland [46]. However, these trusted parties are themselves interested in reducing their risks and aim to use privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs).

Private set intersection (PSI) emerges as a promising privacy-enhancing technology to address these challenges effectively. Morales et al. [25] present an excellent survey of PSI protocols, distinguishing between two-party PSI, multi-party PSI (M-PSI) and delegated (or outsourced) PSI (D-PSI). Two-party PSI is the common case in the literature where two parties privately compute the intersection of their sets of identifiers, while revealing nothing about the identifiers that do not belong to the intersection. M-PSI [9, 10, 12, 17, 28, 30, 34, 38–40, 43, 62, 67, 75] allows multiple (more than two) parties to do so. However, many existing M-PSI protocols are not suitable for deployment by the entities that are entrusted to collect such data while not having any input data of their own. Instead, D-PSI [2–5, 22, 35, 36] – or variants thereof – seem suitable for this case where the intersection is computed at a third party having no input. In particular, D-PSI protocols where multiple (more than two) parties can submit their inputs are relevant in this use case.

Yet, the intersection of identifiers is insufficient information for this use case. The entrusted entity requires additional information about records associated with the identifiers. In two-party PSI, this can be accomplished by labeled PSI [14, 19, 21] where a label is revealed for each identifier in the intersection. This label can be a cryptographic key used to encrypt the additional information in the records to be revealed if the element is in the intersection. However, labeled PSI does not exist for D-PSI or M-PSI protocols. Circuit-PSI, a variant that allows computing any function over the intersection, including revealing cryptographic keys, exists in the M-PSI case [17], but not in the D-PSI case. Furthermore, revealing labels using circuit-PSI is less efficient than using dedicated labeled PSI protocols.

To understand why labeled PSI is non-trivial in the D-PSI case, consider the following complications of the common construction in the two-party case. To encrypt its information a party must have access to the key. In two-party PSI based on oblivious key-value stores (OKVS) – or variants, such as oblivious programmable pseudo-random functions (OPPRF) – this is trivial. The sender, i.e., the holder of the key-value stores, chooses the key and uses it to encrypt its data. The recipient obtains the key if and only if it has the matching identifier. In this case, there is only one key (per identifier), one sender, and one recipient. However, in D-PSI, there are multiple senders and no two sending parties should have the same key, since revealing that key would compromise the confidentiality of the encrypted information. Any key should only be revealed and only to the entrusted party if all parties have the corresponding identifier, i.e., a subset of parties with the same identifier should not reveal any keys. Hence, there is no single other party with whom to compute a “partial intersection”, but instead each party needs to intersect with all other parties, and there is no straightforward reduction from the multi-party case to the two-party case.

Contributions. First, to solve these challenges, we design and prove a new multi-party *Set Intersection Key Agreement* (SIKA) protocol. Second, we show how to use this protocol as a composable functionality when building several practical output protocols, including Labeled D-PSI. Finally, the protocol has been implemented and applied to our use case, LetheLink, demonstrating the practicality of the solution.

The outline of the paper is as follows: we first provide a practical context and requirements in Section 2, followed by related work and general information in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively. Section 5 presents the SIKA protocol and its security proof, followed by output protocols in Section 6. Finally, LetheLink is presented and evaluated in Section 7 followed by conclusions in Section 8.

2 Practical Context and Requirements

In current practice, for privacy reasons, linking data from different (often public) organizations is resolved through a combination of a trusted party, and strong legal regulations. In a next step, the trusted party offers a controlled release of the linked data. Due to regulations such as GDPR and HIPAA, trusted parties aim to use PETs to lower their risks, and mitigate the inherent dangers of managing highly sensitive and valuable information.

This paper stems from a collaboration with a governmental institution tasked with collecting, linking and pseudonymizing citizen, tax and health data; with the primary objective of making D-PSI deployable for their practice.

We first briefly present current practices, followed by the requirements of an enhanced privacy friendly alternative.

Current Practices. Our partner’s current methodology consists of four distinct steps.

Step 1: A researcher needs to access the combined data, linked from multiple data providers, for a particular research project. To that end, a complex query is proposed that will select and combine data from different data providers. The purpose of the research project is documented and the query justified and submitted to the scientific board for approval.

Step 2: The scientific board investigates the requests from researchers and (dis)approves them. The board consists of scientists, lawyers, privacy specialists and possibly a delegation of the data providers involved. It may impose restrictions on the data collection and even prescribe additional privacy-enhancing post-processing to be performed by the trusted party before the data is presented to the researcher.

Step 3: The approval is sent to the data providers (i.e., input parties) who prepare their data (filter attributes and records that can be filtered locally). The data providers send their data including identifiers to the trusted party. The trusted party is in charge of performing the linking, pruning and removing the identifiers.

Step 4: The trusted party cleans and processes the data before presenting the data to the researcher. Depending on the privacy requirements, the researcher may only access the data in a secure and trusted environment or the data is only made available through differential privacy solutions [24].

This approach requires high trust in the trusted party, since it has access to much more personal data than the final result. Moreover, unwanted data leakage may potentially occur to the individual data providers depending on how the data is retrieved from those input parties.

D-PSI as a privacy enhancing alternative. PSI is very diverse and research has led to many different solutions for different problems. A delegated, multi-party variant, D-PSI, is a promising candidate for this use case. It addresses a number of important privacy requirements and current constructions offer practical performance metrics. Current D-PSI constructions, however, lack either all or some of the features that makes them a true fit for our trusted party scenario.

We list the requirements below:

Minimal, but necessary requirements.

- R1 **Data Collector Only.** None of the participating data providers (P) should gain any new information, such as the size or characteristics of another party’s database. Thus, it may not learn whether an identifier belongs to a partial or the full intersection; it may not even learn the sizes of these intersections. The result is only received by a (semi-trusted; i.e., non-colluding) data collector C.
- R2 **Local.** Because of privacy regulations, data providers do not share their database with external parties (except for what belongs to the intersection with the data collector).
- R3 **Pseudonymous.** No real identifiers are revealed to the data collector C. The resulting pseudonyms enable communication between data providers and the data collector regarding specific records.
- R4 **Linking.** The data collector is the only party in the protocol that can link records. In current practice, the party receiving the results is responsible for removing the identifiers after linking records. Currently, most M-PSI solutions result in a set of identifiers in the intersection being revealed to one of the parties.
- R5 **Private Payload Transfer.** For each identifier id_k in the intersection, the data collector learns the corresponding

record Att_k^i in clear text held by each data provider P^i and, hence, may link them. When not in the intersection, the payload is not disclosed.

- R6 **Scalable.** The protocol should scale well, both computationally and what concerns network communication. It should be able to handle large databases with at least a million records and several data providers.

Optional, but highly desired requirements.

- R7 **Intersection Threshold.** It should be possible to specify a minimal cardinality of the intersection before the payload will be disclosed. Due to varying levels of trust and data sensitivity, this threshold may be different for different data providers.
- R8 **Re-Identification.** In some cases, under strong legal requirements, the protocol should allow for re-identification (e.g., for correcting errors, for law enforcement, etc.).

While the properties of traditional D-PSI may not be sufficient, many works have implemented some of these requirements. Resolving the data collector-only requirement (R1), a D-PSI protocol not only needs to delegate the computation of the intersection, but should also allow decryption of the intersection payload at the data collector. This is an extension of the generic D-PSI protocol as identified by Morales et al. [25].

Labeled PSI offers a promising direction to address our requirements for R3 and R4. Considering R3 and R4, in labeled PSI, the receiver obtains a label for each identifier provided by the data source. This label could be used as a cryptographic pseudonym to enable secure payload transfer (R5), for instance, by serving as decryption keys.

However, to the best of our knowledge, a D-PSI variant of labeled PSI, and in fact, a clear definition of what labeled PSI in the multi-party settings entails, does not exist. Assuming in labeled D-PSI each data source decides upon its own labels, and the receiving party may link them together for the same identifier, an efficient implementation is not straightforward, nor does it support R3, in which the identifiers are kept undisclosed.

There is a vast amount of efficient D-PSI (and M-PSI) solutions (see also Related Work in Section 3). While these solutions either include some of these requirements or may somehow be extended to include them, *there is no straightforward solution that covers for all of these requirements*. These gaps motivate our development of a novel, practical protocol designed to comprehensively meet the outlined requirements, enabling secure and efficient deployment in real-world scenarios.

3 Related Work

Private Set Intersection (PSI) [26, 44, 52, 55] allows two parties to compute the intersection of their data sets without revealing any item not in the intersection. This problem has been studied since the 1980s [44] and has been adopted in industrial applications [73]. The term was popularized by Freedman et al. [26]. There has been vast research on improving the efficiency and functionality of PSI. The currently fastest protocols use oblivious pseudo-random functions (OPRF) constructed from vector-oblivious linear evaluations (VOLE) [52, 55]. Morales et al. [25] present an excellent survey of

PSI protocols, distinguishing between two-party PSI, multi-party PSI (M-PSI) and delegated (or outsourced) PSI (D-PSI).

Two-party PSI is the common case in the literature where two parties privately compute the intersection of their sets of identifiers, but nothing about identifiers not in the intersection is revealed. The multi-party private set intersection (M-PSI) problem, first introduced by Kissner and Song [38, 39], involves more than two parties—each holding their own dataset—who wish to compute the intersection of their sets. Since then, several scalable and efficient protocols have been proposed [9, 10, 12, 17, 28, 30, 34, 40, 43, 62, 67, 75]. Scalability and privacy become more complex in M-PSI.

Specialized D-PSI protocols have been developed where the intersection is computed at a third party. Kerschbaum introduced D-PSI as outsourced PSI [35]. He presented a variant where the third party obtains the intersection and one where the third party is blind to the intersection. Later, he also presented using additively homomorphic encryption [36]. Dong et al. [22] later reintroduced the same concept and called the third party a semi-trusted arbiter.

Abadi et al. [3, 5] reintroduced the concept again and called it delegatable PSI (D-PSI), the name adopted in Morales et al.’s survey. Note that Morales et al. only consider the version where the third party is blind to the intersection, and while many protocols are also applicable in the other model introduced by Kerschbaum, a black-box reduction is not obvious. Abadi et al. updated the features of their protocols to include updates of the stored elements [2] and verifiability of the intersection [4].

Evaluation of Feature Support. In this paper, we outlined several requirements, many of which have been addressed individually in prior work, but are rarely supported in combination. While Section 2 defines the full set of requirements, here we highlight a subset that are particularly relevant for comparing with related work. Specifically, we consider from Section 2 for convenience: (i) support for multiple parties contributing input, (ii) that only the collector, not providing input, learns the protocol’s outcome (R1), (iii) that actual identifiers remain hidden and are replaced with pseudonyms (R3), and that the protocol supports the transfer of payloads associated with each identifier in the intersection (R5).

While R1 could in principle be obtained from M-PSI via a black-box reduction to D-PSI with a collector by introducing a third party whose input are all elements in the domain, this is clearly inefficient and does not fulfill the other requirements.

Chandran et al. [17] present a protocol that offers an interesting variant: circuit M-PSI. In circuit M-PSI, each party obtains a secret share of a bit indicating whether the element is in the intersection or not. This bit can then be used to selectively generate output (including shares for a third party), such as the labels (payload) in our protocol. Both two-party [18, 50, 55] and multi-party variants exist [17]. However, outputting one bit has a communication complexity of $O(n^2)$ and we require a label per party (n) and element (m) totaling a communication complexity of $O(n^3m)$.

Table 1 summarizes representative work on D-PSI and Labeled PSI and our core requirements R1, R3 and R5. We discuss the key categories below.

First, we observe two flavors of *two-party D-PSI* (① and ②). While they propose a third party for the computation, this party does not obtain the result (R1). In fact, one of the main goals is that this

party does not learn anything. Hung et al. present a solution that supports R3 and R5, as it implements circuit PSI output [41], but it leaks the intersection size to the third party.

Similarly, in the *multi-party D-PSI* domain, lots of prior work lacks the required features (③). Sharma et al. present PRISM [58], a multi-party delegated circuit-PSI solution (④). The data is secret shared across multiple non-colluding public servers. While R3 and R5 could be solved (inefficiently), the use of multiple public servers contradicts requirement R2, to prevent sharing of data.

Another variant of D-PSI, was introduced by Kerschbaum [35] where the third party, referred to as *the collector*, obtains the intersection. This approach is also known as PSI with an external decider [53] or third party PSI [42, 70–72]. Both variants for two-party (⑤) and multi-party PSI (⑥) are available. Unfortunately, support for R3 and R5 is non-trivial and lacking.

Finally, for *labeled PSI*, a two-party protocol, there are currently no D-PSI versions in which a collector obtains the result (⑦). They may support the payload requirement (R5), but only Karakoç et al. [32] provide a circuit PSI variant that allows pseudonymization of the identifiers (⑧). No multi-party variants exist.

Table 1: Comparison of Delegated and Labeled PSI Variants

Related Work	M-PSI	R1	R3	R5
① [7, 22, 36, 47, 63–66, 69]	✗	✗	✗	✗
② [41]	✗	✗	✓	✓
③ [2–6, 20, 31, 45, 51, 56, 60, 74]	✓	✗	✗	✗
④ [58]	✓	✗	✓	✓
⑤ [42, 70–72]	✗	✓	✗	✗
⑥ [35, 53]	✓	✓	✗	✗
⑦ [14, 19, 21]	✗	✗	✗	✓
⑧ [32]	✗	✗	✓	✓

R1: Collector without input;

R3: pseudonymous intersection;

R5: payload support.

To our knowledge, this is the first practical protocol to meet R1, R3 and R5 simultaneously in a delegated multi-party setting. In this paper, we investigate the functional extensions required for deploying D-PSI where a collector obtains the linked data without revealing the identifier. We design a new protocol using symmetric key cryptography, implementing our requirements set forth and demonstrate practical performance results.

In our protocol, we link data sources using a common identical identifier. While our focus is on exact matches, real-world deployments sometimes require approximate matching on joint attributes, such as name, birthday, telephone number, etc. Protocols for approximate matching are known as private record linkage, e.g., [29, 37, 59, 68], or fuzzy-PSI, e.g., [16, 61]. However, their communication and computation complexity is significantly higher, since more elements need to be compared for matches.

4 Preliminaries

This Section sets the general notation, explains the required cryptographic primitives and elaborates on the security model.

General notation. For correctness, we use super- and subscript with values, sets and lists. A subscript i (e.g., r_i) refers to some element with index i in a set or list. A superscript i as in r^i refers to the value r from party P^i . Likewise R^l refers to the list or set from party P^l and r_j^i is the value with index j in the set from party i .

When needed for clarity, values sent from party P^i to P^j , are denoted as $r^{i \rightarrow j}$.

A collection of elements is marked as a capital E . $|E|$ denotes the cardinality of the collection (i.e., its size). A set is an unordered collection with elements of the same type denoted using curly brackets: $\{e_1, \dots, e_{|E|}\}$. Unlike sets, vectors maintain the order of the elements and are enclosed by angle brackets: $V = \langle e_1, \dots, e_m \rangle$, with m the number of elements in the vector. Tuples also maintain the order of elements, but have elements of different types and are enclosed by parentheses: (e_1, \dots, e_m) .

$[m..n]$ denotes the set of positive integers from m up to n , and $[n]$ is a shorthand for the set of positive integers from 1 up to n . A uniform random selection over all strings of bit length l is denoted by $r \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^l$ and the *exclusive or* (xor) operation by \oplus .

Symmetric Encryption. A *symmetric encryption scheme* secure against attacks targeted against the indistinguishability of ciphertexts (IND-CPA), consists – slightly simplified – of two algorithms: enc and dec. Algorithm enc is defined by $\text{enc}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{l_m} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{l_c}$ and takes as input a key of length n and a message of arbitrary size l_m . The output (of size l_c) is called the ciphertext. Algorithm dec is the corresponding decryption algorithm defined by $\text{dec}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{l_c} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{l_m}$. It takes the same key as input together with the ciphertext and turns it into the corresponding plaintext.

Pseudorandom Permutation (PRP). A (keyed) *pseudorandom permutation* is defined by $\text{prp}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$, which takes as input a key of length n and an input block of size n . A pseudorandom permutation is secure in the standard model if a distinguisher D cannot distinguish prp_n from π_n , which is the set of all permutations on $\{0, 1\}^n$. More formally, for any probabilistic polynomial time (PPT) algorithm D , there is a negligible function negl such that: $|\Pr[D(\text{prp}_n(k, \cdot), \text{prp}_n^{-1}(k, \cdot)) = 1] - \Pr[D(f(\cdot), f^{-1}(\cdot)) = 1]| \leq \text{negl}(n)$, where k and f are uniform random choices over $\{0, 1\}^n$ and π_n respectively [33].

Threshold Secret Sharing. (t, n) *Threshold Secret sharing* [11] was introduced by Shamir [57] and Blakley [15] and allows to split a secret k into n pieces, called shares, such that t (the threshold) of these shares are required to correctly reconstruct the initial secret. With less shares, no information about the secret can be learned.

Let $\text{split}_{t,n,\kappa} : \{0, 1\}^\kappa \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n$ and $\text{recon}_{t,\kappa} : \mathbb{S}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ denote a pair of functions; the first splits a secret of length κ into n shares with threshold t , while the second reconstructs the original secret based on t shares. The domain of secret shares for the function pair $(\text{split}_{t,n,\kappa}, \text{recon}_{t,\kappa})$ is denoted by \mathbb{S} .

A threshold secret sharing scheme is perfectly secure if a distinguisher, which is given less than t shares, is unable to derive

information about the secret. Formally, $\forall t, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $t \leq n$, $\forall k_0, k_1 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa$, $S_i \leftarrow \text{split}_{t, n, \kappa}(k_i)$ for $i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$, $\forall S_j \subseteq S_i$ with $|S_j| < t$: $\Pr[D(S_j, k_0) = 1] = \Pr[D(S_j, k_1) = 1]$.

In Shamir's proposal, each element of \mathbb{S} is a tuple of the form (x, y) , which represents a point on a polynomial of degree $t - 1$ over a finite field. All x values can be taken from $[n]$ to reduce their bit length to $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$.

Oblivious Key Value Store (OKVS). An *Oblivious Key Value Store* is a data structure, formalized by Garimella et al. [27], that compactly represents a key-value mapping $k_i \mapsto v_i$. When the values are randomly chosen over a uniform distribution, the OKVS hides the keys k_i that were used to generate it.

Definition 4.1. A **Key-Value Store (KVS)** is parameterized by a set of keys \mathcal{K} and a set of values \mathcal{V} , and consists of two algorithms:

- **encode** takes as input a set of key-value pairs (k_i, v_i) and outputs, with non-negligible probability, a data structure \mathcal{S} or an error indicator \perp otherwise. Optionally, parameters can be passed as additional input.
- **decode** takes as input the data structure \mathcal{S} and a key k , and outputs a value v .

A KVS is **correct** if, for all $A \subseteq \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{V}$ with distinct keys: $(k, v) \in A$ and $\perp \neq \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{encode}(A) \Rightarrow \text{decode}(\mathcal{S}, k) = v$.

Definition 4.2. A KVS is an **Oblivious Key-Value Store (OKVS)**, if for all distinct keys $\{k_1^0, \dots, k_n^0\}$ and all distinct $\{k_1^1, \dots, k_n^1\}$, if **encode** does not output \perp for $\{k_1^0, \dots, k_n^0\}$ and $\{k_1^1, \dots, k_n^1\}$, then the output of $\mathcal{R}(k_1^0, \dots, k_n^0)$ is computationally indistinguishable from that of $\mathcal{R}(k_1^1, \dots, k_n^1)$, where $\mathcal{R}(k_1, \dots, k_n)$ is defined as:

- For $i \in [n]$, $v_i \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{V}$.
- Output $\text{encode}(\{(k_i, v_i)\}_{i \in [n]})$.

In other words, if the OKVS encodes random values, it is infeasible to tell whether any key $k \in \mathcal{K}$ was used to generate \mathcal{S} or not.

In the remainder, we annotate output of an OKVS with a tilde (e.g., $\tilde{v}_i = \text{decode}(\mathcal{S}, k_i)$), denoting that the receiver is oblivious of whether or not the key-pair (k_i, v_i) was encoded in \mathcal{S} .

Several OKVS constructions exist of which a polynomial p , that is chosen using interpolation such that $p(k_i) = v_i$, is the simplest and size-optimal. Others use Garbled Bloom Filters [23]. Pinkas et al. define an efficient OKVS, called a *probe and XOR of strings* (PAXOS) [49]. Garimella et al. made further improvements to the PAXOS scheme defining 3H-GCT and Bienstock et al. present a near optimal OKVS based on random band matrices [13].

In our implementation, we use the construction of Raghuraman and Rindal [52].

Definition 4.3 (Random decodings). An OKVS satisfies *random decodings* if, for all sets of n distinct keys $A = \{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathcal{K}$, n values $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ each drawn uniformly at random from \mathcal{V} , the output of $\text{decode}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ for a key $k \notin A$ is statistically indistinguishable from a uniformly random element in \mathcal{V} , where $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{encode}(\{(k_i, v_i)\}_{i \in [n]})$.

Security Model. In our multi-party setting, we have two security models. The colluding model for the data providers, where we allow any $n - 1$ of the n data providers to collude, and the non-colluding model for the data collector, who is not allowed to collude with

any data provider. The adversary model used in this work is the semi-honest model. In the semi-honest model, it is assumed that the parties follow the protocol as prescribed, but they may learn and retain information about the inputs and intermediate values.

5 The Set Intersection Key Agreement Functionality and Protocol

To support the requirements outlined in Section 2 and construct our Labeled D-PSI protocol (Section 6), we first present the Set Intersection Key Agreement protocol (SIKA), a composable building block suitable for implementing several practical applications.

The ideal functionality of this protocol is formalized in Functionality 1 $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SIKA}}$. There are n data providers (data sources) P^1, \dots, P^n with input sets X_1, \dots, X_n of equal size $m = |X_i|$ and a single data collector C . From the functionality each data provider learns, for each entry in its local input set, a secret key and a corresponding pseudonym. For all the entries in the intersection of the input sets, and only those entries, C learns from the functionality the same secrets keys and pseudonyms and is able to link those across the different input sets through the use of k .

Protocol 1 Π_{SIKA} realizes this ideal functionality. In the protocol, the n data providers each generate shares for each identifier id_k^i in their local input set X_i (step 1). Those shares are used to jointly compute blinded pseudonyms provided to each P^i (step 2 and 3). If an id_k^i is in the intersection, each P^i obtains a (data provider specific) blinding of the same jointly computed pseudonym. However, if it is not in the intersection, each P^i obtains a blinding of a different random value. To realize this, and ensure that data providers do not learn information about the input set of other parties, the protocol makes use of *Oblivious Key Value Stores* to share the blinded shares. Hence, if the identifier is not in the intersection, at least one data provider P^i has no corresponding blinded share included in his $okvs^{i \rightarrow j}$ for each of the other receiving parties P^j . As a result, each P^j computes a different pseudo-random value, resulting in a blinded random, and unlinkable value $bnym_k^j$. Finally, the data providers send their blinded pseudonyms to the data collector C , together with extra information to allow for unblinding the pseudonym (the z -values). If and only if the corresponding id_k^i is in the intersection, C is able to link the unblinded jointly computed global pseudonym nym_k (step 4). For each id_k^i , the protocol also computes a secret key sk_k^i which can be used by P^i to encrypt a possible payload. Every data source does this based on the z -values. The collector is only able to reconstruct this key for nym in the intersection. For others, it has no clue what z -values to combine.

Correctness. We first show that, in the absence of corruptions, the outputs of both ideal and real protocol are indistinguishable. As in the ideal functionality, the real data provider P^i obtains a set M^i with random $bnym$ and random sk for each of its k id 's. Both are indistinguishable from random as they are, respectively, the XOR of local randomness and the XOR of the (partial) outputs of the OKVSs from all other data providers. For $bnym$ this partial output is the first κ bits, while sk is based on the last κ bits in the OKVSs.

To show that the output of the data collector is also correct, only if id is in the intersection, we see that C is able to link the blinded $bnym$ of each data provider to the same nym. We distinguish two cases:

Functionality 1: \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} - Set Intersection Key Agreement

PARAMETERS: security parameter κ , the size of the inputs m, n data providers P^1, \dots, P^n , and data collector C .

INPUT: each P^i has input $X^i = \{id_1^i, \dots, id_m^i\}^a$, with $id_k^i \in \{0, 1\}^\kappa$,

C has no input.

FUNCTIONALITY:

- (0) Let $\mathbf{P} = \emptyset$
- (1) Upon receipt of (input, X^i) from each data provider:
 - Let $X_\cap = \bigcap_{j \in [n]} X^j$
 - Let $Y_\cap = \{(id, k) \mid id \in X_\cap, k = \text{index}(X_\cap, id)\}$.
 - For each data provider P^i :
 - // associate random nym and key with each identifier
 - Let $M^i = \left\{ (id, \text{bnym}^i, sk^i) \mid id \in X^i, (\text{bnym}^i, sk^i) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^{\kappa \times 2} \right\}$.
 - Send M^i to P^i .
- (2) Upon receiving (proceed) from a data provider P^i and $Y_\cap \neq \emptyset$:
 - Add P^i to \mathbf{P} .
 - If $|\mathbf{P}| = n$, with all $(id, \text{bnym}^i, sk^i) \in M^i$, create R^i as follows, and add it to R :

$$R^i = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\text{bnym}^i, k, sk^i) & (id, k) \in Y_\cap \\ (\text{bnym}^i, \perp, \perp) & id \notin X_\cap \end{array} \right\}$$

- Send R to C .

^aFor ease of presentation, all X^i have cardinality m .

- (1) The id is in the intersection and each data provider obtains a value which was inserted into the OKVS from the other parties. In this case, the blinded bnym is the XOR of a jointly computed nym (which is the same for each P^i) blinded with pseudorandom permutations of known z -values. The data collector is able to unblind the nym using the keys and z -values received from the data providers, link the records and reconstruct the secret key sk .
- (2) The id is not in the intersection; for this id , each bnym is the result of an XOR with at least one value indistinguishable from random (by definition of an OKVS for values not encoded), hence, unlinkable.

From the preceding high-level description of Π_{SIKA} , it is clear that the protocol is correct with respect to the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} except in the event of a false positive, i.e., $\text{nym}_k = \text{bnym}_k^1 \oplus_{j \neq 1} \text{prp}_\kappa(\text{key}^1, z_k^{1 \rightarrow j}) = \dots = \text{bnym}_k^n \oplus_{j \neq n} \text{prp}_\kappa(\text{key}^n, z_k^{n \rightarrow j})$ for some $id_k \in X_i$ and $id_k \in X_j$ for $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$. Since P^i does not have id_k in its input set, it will not have programmed its OKVS with this id_k . As a result, $\tilde{z}_k^{i \rightarrow j}, \tilde{bs}_k^{i \rightarrow j}$, and consequently, $\widetilde{\text{bnym}}_k^j$ (for each other P^j) will be pseudorandom. The probability that the unblinded $\widetilde{\text{nym}}_k^i$ matches the other $n - 1$ unblinded $\widetilde{\text{nym}}_k^j$ is negligible.

Security.

THEOREM 1. *Protocol Π_{SIKA} is secure in the semi-honest model, against any number of colluding, semi-honest input parties and against a non-colluding, but possibly malicious data collector.*

PROOF. We first prove that the protocol is secure in the presence of semi-honest colluding data providers, followed by a proof in the presence of a semi-honest data collector.

Consider $n - 1$ Semi-honest Data Providers. Colluding entities share everything with each other: inputs, outputs, messages received and sent, and random values used. We now prove that the protocol is secure against $n - 1$ colluding semi-honest data providers. As a consequence, it is also secure against smaller sets of colluding semi-honest data providers. Since n data providers already have all the information, allowing n colluding data providers is senseless. Without loss of generality, let P^1 be the only uncorrupted data provider. Let \mathbf{P} denote all the data providers and \mathbf{P}^* all corrupted data providers (i.e., $\mathbf{P} \setminus \{P^1\}$).

Simulator 1, denoted $\text{Sim}_{\mathbf{P}^*}$, runs the real adversary \mathcal{A} internally and passes the messages between the environment \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{A} . Likewise, it passes the messages (e.g., leakage of state and continuation) between the semi-honest parties and \mathcal{A} .

To demonstrate the correctness of this simulation, we describe the following sequence of hybrid simulators which behave incrementally different from the real protocol until the final hybrid is the simulator $\text{Sim}_{\mathbf{P}^*}$. Showing that each change is indistinguishable from the previous one, from the perspective of the environment \mathcal{Z} , demonstrates that the real execution of the protocol is indistinguishable from the ideal execution of the \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} functionality.

Hybrid 1. For each simulated P^i , and for $k \in [m]$, $\text{Sim}_{\mathbf{P}^*}$ first samples sk_k^i at random, then samples $z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$ at random for $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, and then computes

$$z_k^{i \rightarrow i} \leftarrow sk_k^i \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} z_k^{i \rightarrow j}.$$

This is identically distributed to the real protocol.

Hybrid 2. The simulator initializes an empty list \mathcal{L}_{id} . For $i \in [1, n]$ and for $k \in [m]$ the simulator first checks if $id_k^i \in X_i$ is saved in \mathcal{L}_{id} ; if it is, the simulator sets $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ according to the list. If id_k^i

Protocol 1: Π_{SIKA}

PARAMETERS: security parameter κ , the size of the inputs m, n data providers P^1, \dots, P^n , and data collector C .

INPUT: each P^i has a set X^i of identifiers $id_k^i \in \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ with input length m^a , C has no input.

PROTOCOL:

- (1) Each P^i chooses a key $key^i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa$, generates a random nym share $s_k^i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ for each $k \in [m]$, and random $z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$ -shares (of size κ) for each $k \in [m]$ and $j \in [n]$. // z-values serve double purpose:
 - // (a) they determine the secret key: $sk_k^i = \bigoplus_{j \in [n]} z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$
 - // (b) they are used in computing the blinding factors: $\text{prp}_\kappa(key^i, z_k^{i \rightarrow j})$
 - (2) Each P^i sends to each other data provider P^j ($i \neq j$) an OKVS encoded as follows:

$$okvs^{i \rightarrow j} = \text{encode}_m \left(\left\{ (id_k, \langle bs_k^{i \rightarrow j}, z_k^{i \rightarrow j} \rangle) \mid k \in [m], id_k \in X_i, bs_k^{i \rightarrow j} \leftarrow s_k^i \oplus \text{prp}_\kappa(key^i, z_k^{i \rightarrow j}) \right\} \right).$$

// $z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$ is encoded in the OKVS, because C needs it to remove part of the blinding and to recover sk_k^i
 - (3) Every P^j , once it received an $okvs^{i \rightarrow j}$ from all other data providers:
 - Recover all bs and z -values from $\langle \tilde{bs}_k^{i \rightarrow j}, \tilde{z}_k^{i \rightarrow j} \rangle \leftarrow \text{decode}_m(okvs^{i \rightarrow j}, id_k^j)$ for each $id_k^j \in X_j$ and $okvs^{i \rightarrow j}$ received from each P^i .
 - Set $M^j = \{ (id_k, \langle \widetilde{bs}_k^j, sk_k^j \rangle) \mid k \in [m], id_k \in X_j, \widetilde{bs}_k^j = s_k^j \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} \tilde{bs}_k^{i \rightarrow j}, sk_k^j = \bigoplus_{i \in [n]} \tilde{z}_k^{i \rightarrow j} \}$.
 - Send key^j and $B^j = \{ (\langle \widetilde{bs}_k^j, \langle \tilde{z}_k^{1 \rightarrow j}, \dots, \tilde{z}_k^{n \rightarrow j} \rangle \rangle) \mid k \in [m] \}$ to C .
 - Output M^j .
 - (4) Upon receipt of B^i with entries $(\langle \widetilde{bs}_k^i, \tilde{z}_k^{1 \rightarrow j} \rangle)$ and key^i from data provider P^i , C computes the following:
 - If P^i provided input before: Ignore B^i and key^i .
 - If every P^j provided B^j :
 - Let $R = \emptyset$.
 - For each P^i : // map blinded pseudonym to global pseudonym by removing the blinding
 - Let $N^i = \{ (\widetilde{nym}_k^i, \widetilde{bs}_k^i) \mid k \in [m] \}$ with $\widetilde{nym}_k^i \leftarrow \widetilde{bs}_k^i \oplus \bigoplus_{j \neq i} \text{prp}_\kappa(key^j, \tilde{z}_k^{j \rightarrow i})$.
 - // compute intersection: If the same global nym is found in N^1 and N^2 , it must be found in all N^i
 - Let $Nyms_\cap = [\widetilde{nym} \mid (\widetilde{nym}, \cdot, \cdot) \in N^1, (\widetilde{nym}, \cdot, \cdot) \in N^2]$.
 - For each P^i :
 - // Tricky! Recover the secret key sk_k^i , by retrieving all the $\tilde{z}_k^{i \rightarrow j}$ from B^j , with $j \in [n]$.
- $$R^i = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\widetilde{nym}_k^i, p_k, sk_k^i) & (\widetilde{nym}_k^i, \widetilde{bs}_k^i) \in N^i \text{ and } \widetilde{nym}_k^i \in Nyms_\cap, \text{ with } p_k = \text{index}(Nyms_\cap, \widetilde{nym}_k^i) \text{ and} \\ & sk_k^i = \bigoplus_{j \in [n]} \tilde{z}_k^{i \rightarrow j} \text{ where } ((\widetilde{nym}_k^i, \widetilde{bs}_k^i) \in N^j \text{ and } (\langle \widetilde{bs}_k^j, \langle \tilde{z}_k^{1 \rightarrow j}, \dots, \tilde{z}_k^{n \rightarrow j} \rangle \rangle) \in B^j)) \\ (\widetilde{nym}_k^i, \perp, \perp) & (\widetilde{nym}_k^i, \widetilde{bs}_k^i) \in N^i \text{ and } \widetilde{nym}_k^i \notin Nyms_\cap. \end{array} \right\}$$
- Add R^i to R .
- Output R .

^aFor ease of presentation, all X_i have cardinality m .

is not in the list, the simulator samples $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ uniformly at random, and then adds $(id_k^i, s_k^{1 \rightarrow i})$ to the list \mathcal{L}_{id} . This method ensures that if any identifier is present in multiple input sets X_i , then the same $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ value is assigned to it.

The simulator then constructs the $n - 1$ OKVSs $okvs^{1 \rightarrow i}$ using the identifiers $id_k^i \in X_i$, for $k \in [m]$, as in the real protocol, but with the $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ values as determined by \mathcal{L}_{id} for these identifiers. The consequence of this is that the OKVSs sent by party P^1 to parties P^i and $P^{i'}$ will be based on different $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ and $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i'}$ values for the same identifier id_k^1 if that identifier is not in $X_i \cap X_{i'}$.

Let G denote the game played by the environment against Hybrid 1, and let G' denote the game it plays against Hybrid 2. Furthermore, let $\Delta(G, G')$ denote the difference in the probability that \mathcal{Z} outputs 1 when playing either G or G' . First, we observe that $G = G \mid PRP$, and the same holds for G' since the real protocol uses

a PRP for the inputs to the OKVSs. We then have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(G \mid PRP, G' \mid PRP) &\leq 2\Delta(PRP, PRF) \\ &\quad + \Delta(G \mid PRF, G' \mid PRF) \\ \Delta(G \mid PRF, G' \mid PRF) &\leq 2\Delta(PRF, \mathcal{U}) \\ &\quad + \Delta(G \mid \mathcal{U}, G' \mid \mathcal{U}) \\ \Delta(G \mid \mathcal{U}, G' \mid \mathcal{U}) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta(PRP, PRF)$ and $\Delta(PRF, \mathcal{U})$ respectively denote the distinguishing error between a PRP and a PRF, and between a PRF and the uniform distribution (assuming the multi-query versions of the PRP-PRF distinguishing experiment and of the PRF security experiment).

Simulator 1: Simp^*

For corrupted $P^i \in \mathcal{P}^*$, Sim receives X^i from \mathcal{Z} . It then sends (input, X^i) to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SIKA}}$ and receives $M^i = \{(id_k^i, \text{bnym}_k^i, sk_k^i) \mid id_k^i \in X^i\}$. For every $P^i \in \mathcal{P}$, Sim samples $key^i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ and initializes an empty list \mathcal{L}_{id} . For $i \in [2, n]$:

- (1) For each $j \in [n] \setminus i$ and for $k \in [m]$, Sim uniformly samples $z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$ and then computes $z_k^{i \rightarrow i} \leftarrow sk_k^i \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} z_k^{i \rightarrow j}$.
- (2) For $j \in [n] \setminus i$, Sim computes $okvs^{i \rightarrow j}$ according to the protocol.
- (3) For $k \in [m]$, Sim checks whether there exists some s^* such that $(id_k, s^*) \in \mathcal{L}_{id}$ for $id_k \in X^i$. If it does, Sim sets $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i} \leftarrow s^*$. Otherwise, Sim samples $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ uniformly at random and adds $(id_k, s_k^{1 \rightarrow i})$ to \mathcal{L}_{id} .
- (4) For $k \in [m]$, Sim retrieves $(id_k, s_k^{1 \rightarrow i})$, for $id_k \in X^i$ from \mathcal{L}_{id} and computes

$$z_k^{1 \rightarrow i} \leftarrow PRP^{-1} \left(key_1, \begin{matrix} \text{bnym}_k^i \oplus s_k^i \oplus s_k^{1 \rightarrow i} \\ \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in [n] \setminus \{1, i\}} bs_k^{j \rightarrow i} \end{matrix} \right),$$

where bnym_k^i comes from M^i and $bs_k^{j \rightarrow i}$ is decoded from $okvs^{j \rightarrow i}$ according to the protocol.

- (5) Sim then constructs $okvs^{1 \rightarrow i}$ using id_k from X^i and the corresponding $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ and $z_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ as generated above.

Hybrid 3. For $i \in [2, n]$, each P_i first samples bnym_k^i at random, for $k \in [m]$, and P_1 then computes

$$z_k^{1 \rightarrow i} \leftarrow PRP^{-1} \left(key_1, \text{bnym}_k^i \oplus s_k^i \oplus s_k^{1 \rightarrow i} \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in [n] \setminus \{1, i\}} \widetilde{bs}_k^{j \rightarrow i} \right).$$

Since bnym_k^i is uniformly distributed, so will be the input to PRP^{-1} and so will be $z_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$, identically to how it was sampled in the protocol. The last value $z_k^{1 \rightarrow 1}$ does not need to be computed since it remains outside of the environment's view because P^1 and the data collector C are both honest. Only if an identifier is in the intersection, then the environment can reconstruct $z_k^{1 \rightarrow 1}$ from the other $z_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ shares and the sk_k^1 value returned by the data collector, but this would still be identically distributed to the real protocol.

Hybrid 4. The simulator now computes the list \mathcal{L}_{id} using only $i \in [2, n]$, i.e., it does not populate it with information from X^1 . To build the OKVSs, the simulator now uses the identifiers $id_k^i \in X_i$ for $okvs^{1 \rightarrow i}$, together with the $s_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$ values from the list \mathcal{L}_{id} and the z -shares $z_k^{1 \rightarrow i}$.

For each $okvs^{1 \rightarrow i}$, the differences with Hybrid 3 are:

- (1) the entries with identifiers $id^1 \in X^1 \setminus (X^1 \cap X^i)$ are no longer encoded, and
- (2) the entries with keys $id^i \in X^i \setminus (X^1 \cap X^i)$ are now encoded.

Denoting by G the game against Hybrid 3, and by G' the game against Hybrid 4, we then have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(G \mid PRP, G' \mid PRP) &\leq 2\Delta(PRP, PRF) + 2\Delta(PRF, \mathcal{U}) \\ &\quad + \Delta(G \mid \mathcal{U}, G' \mid \mathcal{U}), \\ \Delta(G \mid \mathcal{U}, G' \mid \mathcal{U}) &= \epsilon_{oblv}. \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_{oblv} denotes the obliviousness error of the OKVS.

Hybrid 5. The simulator no longer samples but instead obtains the sk_k^i and bnym_k^i values for the semi-honest parties within the M^i sets from the functionality; the view that this presents to \mathcal{Z} is identically distributed to that of Hybrid 4.

Consider a malicious but non-colluding data collector. The simulator Sim_C receives $R = (R^1, \dots, R^n)$ from $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SIKA}}$, with $|R^i| = m$ and

$$R^i = \left\{ \begin{cases} (\text{bnym}_j^i, k, sk_j^i), & (id_j, k) \in Y_{\cap}, \\ (\text{bnym}_j^i, \perp, \perp), & (id_j, *) \notin Y_{\cap}. \end{cases} \right\}$$

The malicious but non-colluding data collector outputs to the environment \mathcal{Z} the same set R that it received from $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SIKA}}$. Therefore, Sim_C 's only task is to simulate the messages sent from each honest data provider P^i to C identically to the protocol. (This is assuming that the honest parties use private and authenticated channels to communicate with each other so that the adversary cannot observe the messages sent between honest parties.)

To simulate key_i , the simulator samples it uniformly at random as in the protocol. To simulate $\widetilde{\text{bnym}}_j^i$, for $j \in [m]$, Sim_C uses the bnym_j^i from R^i . To simulate the z -shares sent by each P^i , the simulator samples $z_j^{2 \rightarrow i}, \dots, z_j^{n \rightarrow i}$ uniformly at random and sets

$$z_j^{1 \rightarrow i} = \begin{cases} sk_j^i \oplus \bigoplus_{l=2}^n z_n^{l \rightarrow i} & (*, *, sk_j^i) \in R^i, \\ \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This sampling of the z -shares is indistinguishable from the real protocol's distribution since their correlation with the sk key is ensured when the corresponding identifier is in the intersection of the input sets and since the environment has no information about the honest parties' real values of the z -shares under the assumption of private channels. \square

6 Output Protocols

Based on the SIKA protocol, we present a number of practical output protocols, including the Labeled D-PSI with payload, that show the flexibility of the construction. We build upon universal composability to derive the security of the combined core and output protocols. Since most output protocols are trivial w.r.t. the SIKA protocol, the proofs of the combined protocols are omitted; we include an argument for the security of the main payload protocol based on $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SIKA}}$.

sub1 - Cardinality. A simple result is to obtain the size of the intersection: the data collector outputs the highest value of k in its result set R .

sub2 - Labeled D-PSI. Many practical scenarios (including that of Section 7), require the inclusion of a payload. Applications often

Functionality 2: $\mathcal{F}_{payload}$

PARAMETERS:

κ ,
 n data providers P^1, \dots, P^n , and data collector C .

INPUT:

Each P^i has input $Recs_i = \{(id_k^i, Atts_k^i)\}_{k \in [m]}$.
 C has no input.

FUNCTIONALITY:

- (1) Upon receipt of $Recs_i$ from each data provider P^i :
 - Let $X_i = \{id_k^i \mid (id_k^i, \cdot) \in Recs_i\}$, and
 - Set $X_\cap = \bigcap_i X_i$.
 Send $Recs_\cap = \{(Atts_{k_1}^1, \dots, Atts_{k_n}^n) \mid$
 $id \in X_\cap, \forall j \in [n] : (id, Atts_{k_j}^j) \in Recs_j\}$ to C .

require revealing records associated with identifiers in the intersection. For privacy reasons, the identifiers, even the ones in the intersection, should remain hidden.

Therefore, we develop an output protocol that supports payloads. While standard (D-)PSI requires to first obtain the intersection, followed by a privacy-friendly protocol to retrieve the records, our approach is different. The payload is encrypted in advance for each entry in the local input set, and passed to the data collector, without knowledge of the intersection. The encryption ensures that the data collector can only decrypt a record if its identifier is in the intersection, thereby protecting the confidentiality of non-intersecting entries. To implement this (n, n) -threshold encryption of the payload, we use the keys given to the data providers for each entry in their input set and the keys received by the data collector for each record in the intersection. In order to encrypt a record with identifier id_k^i , each P^i takes its encryption key \tilde{sk}_k^i and encrypts the payload corresponding to this identifier. The ciphertexts are then sent to C together with the corresponding local pseudonym (i.e., \widetilde{bnym}_k^i). Each data provider P^i sends the encrypted records to the data collector C :

$$\left\{ (\widetilde{bnym}_k^i, \text{enc}_\kappa(\tilde{sk}_k^i, data_k^i)) \mid k \in [m] \right\}$$

Functionality 2 and Protocol 2 present the ideal functionality $\mathcal{F}_{payload}$ and its protocol implementation $\Pi_{payload}$, respectively. The protocol takes advantage of \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} . After running the ideal functionality, the data collector obtains the pseudonyms and corresponding secrets for each identifier in the intersection. Upon receipt of the ciphertexts and corresponding pseudonym, the data collector is able to find the corresponding sk_k^i and decrypts the ciphertexts.

We briefly argue the security of $\Pi_{payload}$; since the simulator emulates \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} , it receives the input set of each P^i and samples the secret keys used for encryption. Using these, it can perfectly simulate the messages sent to the data collector C for the plaintexts contained in $Recs_\cap$ that it received from $\mathcal{F}_{payload}$. For the other messages sent from P^i to C , the simulator instead encrypts arbitrary messages; this is indistinguishable from the honest messages of $\Pi_{payload}$ because of the IND-CPA security of the encryption scheme.

Protocol 2: $\Pi_{payload}$

PARAMETERS:

$\mathcal{F}_{SIKA}, \kappa$,
 n data providers P^1, \dots, P^n , and data collector C .

INPUT:

Each P^i has input $Recs_i = \{(id_k^i, Atts_k^i)\}_{k \in [m]}$.
 C has no input.

PROTOCOL:

- (1) Each data provider P^i (with input $X_i = \{id_k^i \mid (id_k^i, \cdot) \in Recs_i\}$), and the data collector C (without input) engage in \mathcal{F}_{SIKA} .
 Every party P^i gets \bar{M}^i , and C gets \bar{R} .
- (2) Every data provider P^i :
 - For each $(id_k^i, \widetilde{bnym}_k^i, sk_k^i)$ in \bar{M}^i :
 - Let $c_k^i = \text{enc}_\kappa(\tilde{sk}_k^i, Atts_k^i)$.
 - Send $Recs_i' = \{(\widetilde{bnym}_k^i, c_k^i)\}_{k \in [m]}$ to C .
- (3) For the data collector C , upon receipt of $Recs_i'$ from P^i :
 - Let $Recs_i^* \leftarrow \emptyset$.
 - For each record $(\widetilde{bnym}_k^i, c^i)$ in $Recs_i'$,
 - If $(\widetilde{bnym}_k^i, k, sk_k^i)$ in \bar{R} and $sk_k^i \neq \perp$:
 - Let $Atts_k^i = \text{dec}_\kappa(sk_k^i, c^i)$, and
 - Add $(k, Atts_k^i)$ to $Recs_i^*$.
 Output $Recs_\cap = \{(k, Atts_{k_1}^1, \dots, Atts_{k_n}^n) \mid$
 $\exists k \in [|X_i|],$
 $\forall j \in [n] : (k, Atts_{k_j}^j) \in Recs_j^*\}$.

Sub-protocols of Sub2 - Labeled D-PSI. We now present three sub-protocols of the labeled D-PSI:

sub2.1 - D-PSI. This is the application of the (n, n) -threshold encryption to the identifiers. To obtain the intersection of the identifiers, the data providers encrypt the identifiers id_k^i with \tilde{sk}_k^i and share them with the data collector who can decrypt them if and only if they are part of the intersection.

sub2.2 - Labeled D-PSI with payload. In this protocol, data from different providers is linked in a privacy-preserving manner. In this case, the input sets are extended with attributes held by each data provider. Again using the (n, n) -threshold encryption applied to each record in the local data set, the ciphertext is passed to the data collector, who can decrypt the records corresponding to identifiers that are part of the intersection. The identifiers themselves, are not revealed.

sub2.3 - Threshold Labeled D-PSI with payload. Labeled D-PSI with payload can easily be extended with an additional (t, m) -**threshold encryption**, such that the payload can only be decrypted when the size of the intersection exceeds some threshold t . To that end, each data provider P^i chooses a random secret v^i and splits it in $m = |X^i|$ shares sh_k^i using Shamir's (t, m) -secret sharing scheme:

$$v^i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\kappa$$

$$\{sh_1^i, \dots, sh_m^i\} \leftarrow \text{split}_{t, m, \kappa}(v^i)$$

Each payload record is extended with one unique share sh_k^i which is encrypted with the (n, n) -threshold encryption key \tilde{sk}_k^i (see above) while the payload is encrypted using $(v^i \oplus \tilde{sk}_k^i)$. The message each data provider P^i sends to the data collector C now includes:

$$\left\{ (\dots, \text{enc}_{\kappa}(v_{\oplus}^i \tilde{sk}_k^i, data_k^i), \text{enc}_{\kappa}(\tilde{sk}_k^i, sh_k^i)) \mid k \in [m] \right\}$$

If the intersection size is at least t , the data collector will be able to decrypt enough shares sh_k^i to reconstruct the random secret v^i , and hence, compute the decryption key of the payload itself. Otherwise, the payload remains hidden. Note that the size of the intersection is always revealed.

Different data providers may use different thresholds t^i . In that case, some of the payload data may remain hidden (when the intersection size is smaller than t^i for some P^i), while other parts can be decrypted.

The output protocols above demonstrate how the SIKa protocol can be leveraged to permit privacy-enhancing protocols. Moreover, combinations of the output protocols are also possible. Although more efficient solutions for both *sub1* and *sub2.1* may exist, these examples illustrate the flexibility of our approach.

It is also worth noting that while the underlying SIKa functionality, presented in Section 5, assumes that the input sets X_i have equal size m across all parties, this assumption often does not hold in practice. However, this can be easily mitigated by padding smaller input sets with dummy records. Alternatively, to reduce communication overhead, input parties with smaller input sets may encode smaller OKVSs. However, this may leak information about the input set sizes to other entities in the protocol.

7 LetheLink: Linking data from multiple data providers with unique identifiers

This Section introduces LetheLink, a practical implementation of linking data based on the requirements outlined in Section 2.

LetheLink is a command-line interface (CLI) tool that implements the SIKa protocol and two of the payload sub-protocols: Labeled D-PSI with payload (*sub 2.2*), and its threshold variant (*sub 2.3*). It is designed to demonstrate the protocols' practical applicability. LetheLink integrates with the controller's existing architecture, and supports cleartext analysis of the data. Furthermore, no information is leaked to the input parties, and the amount of information revealed to the collector is strictly minimized. Personal identifiers are no longer exposed, and data is only available to the collector if it is part of the intersection. In fact, sensitive data is only revealed if the intersection is sufficiently large. This integration is essential for our governmental partner to improve privacy and trust, improving step 3 from current practices.

Procedure. Before the actual protocol is executed, a scientific board prepares and digitally signs a JSON configuration file, which is distributed to the input parties and collector. This file contains all the parameters and connection information required to execute the protocol. Additionally, it contains a human-readable description of the required data, based on which each input party prepares a comma-separated data file (i.e., a CSV file) containing the potentially relevant (identified) personal data. To execute the protocol,

input parties and the collector use the same CLI client application, providing the shared JSON file. Additionally, each input party provides its own CSV file. Upon successful completion, the collector's client outputs a CSV file containing the combined attributes from all data providers for the records in the intersection.

The remainder of this Section discusses the implementation details and performance results of the SIKa protocol (without payload), and the Labeled D-PSI with payload sub-protocols (*sub 2.2* and *2.3*).

7.1 Configuration, Infrastructure and Method

The client is built in Java 17. For the OKVS, we selected and integrated the multi-threaded clustering-based C++ implementation of the scheme of Raghuraman et al. [1, 52] into LetheLink using the Java Native Interface (JNI). The length of the values in the OKVS is set to twice the key length κ , matching the requirements of the SIKa protocol. The pseudo-random permutation with a one-time key, as required by SIKa, is implemented with AES in CBC mode with zero initialization vector. For the pseudorandom number generator (PRNG), we use SHA1PRNG.

Performance tests were conducted on AWS EC2 r7i.8xlarge VMs, with 32 vCPUs (Intel Xeon Platinum 8588C processors at a frequency of 3.2 Ghz) and 256 GB RAM. Core utilization is optimized in our multithreaded application to maximize performance. The machines used storage with 3000 IOPS and a throughput of 125 MB/s. The operating system was Ubuntu 24.04 LTS.

The LAN and WAN environments simulated using tc Linux command, are configured to reflect typical real-world conditions, with speeds of 1 Gbps and 150 Mbps and latencies of 1 ms and 30 ms, respectively.

The total runtimes in Table 2, as well as the runtime overhead reported in Tables 4 and 5, are averaged over 20 runs for $m \leq 2^{22}$ and over 10 runs for $m = 2^{24}$. Detailed performance logs are available as supplementary artifacts and back the numbers mentioned in this section. The runtimes exclude starting the LetheLink client and establishing connections.

7.2 SIKa Protocol

In this Section, we evaluate the performance of the SIKa Protocol, which returns only secrets and pseudonyms returned to the input parties, while the collector obtains those for the intersection. Although SIKa alone is not sufficient as a complete application, this enables us to assess the core performance and scalability of LetheLink. Table 2 and 3 show the total runtime and data transfer of the SIKa protocol under varying conditions. These results provide insights into the efficiency and scalability of the protocol in different network environments.

The computational and statistical security are κ and λ , respectively. The OKVS operations were evaluated with two combined security levels: $(\kappa = 128, \lambda = 40)$, and $(\kappa = 256, \lambda = 80)$ ¹. Furthermore, the weight parameter, specific for this type of OKVS, was set to the recommended value 3 and hardware acceleration enabled.

¹Due to implementation restrictions of the OKVS by Raghuraman et al., the current implementation is limited to only handle statistical security up to 64. Overriding this limit is possible, but results in performance results that are slightly more positive than they should be if $\lambda = 80$.

Table 2: Total runtime in seconds of the SIKA protocol, starting with loading CSV files by the data providers and finishing after the collector has stored the output CSV file. The intersection size is $m/2^4$.

m	LAN						WAN					
	$\kappa = 128, \lambda = 40$			$\kappa = 256, \lambda = 80$			$\kappa = 128, \lambda = 40$			$\kappa = 256, \lambda = 80$		
	$n = 3$	$n = 5$	$n = 7$	$n = 3$	$n = 5$	$n = 7$	$n = 3$	$n = 5$	$n = 7$	$n = 3$	$n = 5$	$n = 7$
2^{16}	< 1	1	2	1	1	1	< 1	1	2	1	2	4
2^{18}	2	4	5	3	5	7	4	7	9	6	10	14
2^{20}	10	18	26	12	22	30	14	25	36	25	39	54
2^{22}	58	91	117	67	106	145	74	123	167	102	166	241
2^{24}	312	362	486	356	413	570	386	473	674	500	663	961

Table 3: Measured data transfer in MB. The volumes sent by a data provider to another data provider and to the collector are denoted by $P^i \rightarrow P^j$ and $P^i \rightarrow C$ respectively.

m	$\kappa = 128, \lambda = 40$		$\kappa = 256, \lambda = 80$	
	$P^i \rightarrow P^j$	$P^i \rightarrow C$	$P^i \rightarrow P^j$	$P^i \rightarrow C$
2^{16}	3	$2 + n$	7	$3 + 2n$
2^{18}	12	$9 + 4n$	24	$13 + 8n$
2^{20}	46	$37 + 16n$	89	$53 + 32n$
2^{22}	181	$150 + 64n$	344	$214 + 128n$
2^{24}	713	$607 + 256n$	1352	$863 + 512n$

Computation. As shown in Table 2, the runtime increases significantly with larger values of m , primarily due to higher computational and communication demands. For example, in the LAN setting with $\kappa = 128$, the runtime increases from less than one second when $m = 2^{16}$ to more than five minutes when $m = 2^{24}$ (for three data providers). The protocol behaves slightly superlinear in m ; increasing m by a factor of four, as done in the experiments, results in an increase in the total runtime of up to factor 5.8 and by a factor 4.4 on average.

Due to concurrency between and inside clients, the experiments demonstrate a sublinear behavior of the total runtime with respect to the number of data providers, provided sufficiently fast connections. For example, switching from three to seven data providers results in an increase of less than 60% of the overall execution time for $n = 2^{24}$ in the LAN setting.

Switching from the LAN to WAN setting evidently impacts the total runtime. For instance, for $m = 2^{24}$, we observe an increase by 24% for $n = 3$, $\kappa = 128$, and $\lambda = 40$ up to 69% for $n = 7$, $\kappa = 256$, and $\lambda = 80$. Data processing and communication occur concurrently, but the latter becomes more dominant over slower connections.

The runtimes summarized in Table 2 become more stable – and hence, predictable – for larger m . The highest relative standard deviation (RSD) decreases from 8.6% for $m = 2^{20}$ to 4.8% for both $m = 2^{22}$ and $m = 2^{24}$. Also, more communication overhead results in more stable runtimes; by switching from LAN to WAN, the average RSD decreases from 6.6%, 2.3% and 3.4% to 1.8%, 2.2%, and 1.0%, for the aforementioned values of m respectively.

The computations are dominated by the pseudonym unblinding at the collector; for $n = 2^{24}$ this takes between 31% and 51% of the

total runtime in the LAN setting. The OKVS encode and decode operations, performed $n - 1$ times by each data provider, contribute only marginally to the total runtime. For example, encoding 2^{24} items takes approximately nine seconds, while decoding requires about five seconds ($\lambda = 40$; $\kappa = 128$).

The total runtime also includes several additional tasks. For the data provider, this encompasses, among others, reading the input file, preparing inputs for the OKVS and creating and sending the messages. For the collector, this encompasses, among others, receiving and parsing the messages, calculating the intersection and writing the output files.

The intersection size only marginally impacts the total runtime; for $m = 2^{24}$, calculating the intersection and storing the output took maximum 6.4% and 0.5% of the total runtime respectively.

Data transfer. Table 3 presents the measured data transferred (in MB for $n = 3$). Each data provider sends data to the $n - 1$ other providers ($P^i \rightarrow P^j$), consisting primarily of the OKVS, scaling linearly with the number of records. The volume sent from a provider to the collector ($P^i \rightarrow C$) includes pseudonyms paired with corresponding z -values. In Table 3, we distinguish between a fixed-size portion and a variable portion that grows with increasing number of parties. The fixed part includes the pseudonym and overhead from the current encoding, while the variable part can be estimated as $n \cdot m \cdot \kappa$ (in bits), representing the volume of the z -values introduced per data source.

The total communication cost is thus $n(n - 1)$ times the volume sent from a data provider P^i to a data provider P^j plus n times the volume sent from P^i to C . For $m = 2^{24}$, this corresponds to 8.2 GB and 15.0 GB for $\kappa = 128$ and $\kappa = 256$, respectively. Consequently, the total data volume received by C increases quadratically in n , although this is not reflected in the runtimes of the conducted experiments.

7.3 Labeled D-PSI with payload

Table 4 presents the runtime overhead of the Labeled D-PSI with payload extension (*sub2.2*) for $n = 3$. The relative standard deviation of the total runtimes of the experiments ranges from 0.8% to 8.3% for $n \geq 18$.

To keep memory use within limits, the collector stores received messages before processing them. This goes at the expense of time efficiency. In the LAN setting, I/O operations account for 40% to 100% of the additional time for $m \geq 2^{18}$. In contrast, in the WAN

Table 4: Runtime overhead in seconds of the Labeled D-PSI (sub2.2) extension for $n = 3$, with l the byte size of the record payload.

$m \setminus l$	LAN				WAN			
	$\kappa = 128$		$\kappa = 256$		$\kappa = 128$		$\kappa = 256$	
	2^6	2^8	2^6	2^8	2^6	2^8	2^6	2^8
2^{16}	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1	< 1	1
2^{18}	< 1	2	< 1	2	1	5	2	5
2^{20}	3	7	5	8	7	20	7	20
2^{22}	12	30	14	34	17	71	29	83

Table 5: Runtime overhead in seconds of the Labeled Threshold D-PSI (sub2.3) extension for $n = 3$ in the LAN setting.

$m \setminus t$	$\kappa = 128$			$\kappa = 256$		
	2^{10}	2^{12}	2^{14}	2^{10}	2^{12}	2^{14}
2^{16}	< 1	2	9	< 1	3	19
2^{18}	2	9	41	4	18	84
2^{20}	6	35	164	16	72	336
2^{22}	13	121	640	53	270	1317

setting, communication once again becomes the dominant factor, contributing between 59% and 100% of the additional time.

The time complexity of the extension is $O(nm)$, since the collector decrypts the attributes of the m records for each of the n data providers.

7.4 Threshold Labeled D-PSI with payload

For the threshold variant (sub2.3), we used a finite field implementation [54] of Shamir secret sharing that enables encoding secrets up to 128 and 192 bits. Larger secrets are split prior to encoding. For instance, a 256 bit secret is split in two 128 bit components. Since Shamir secret sharing offers information-theoretic security, this does not affect security guarantees.

Table 5 shows the runtime overhead of the Threshold Labeled D-PSI in a LAN setting with $n = 3$. The computational overhead is primarily incurred by the data providers and is negligible for the collector. As each data provider computes its m shares independently and in parallel to one another, increasing n has a negligible impact on the overall computation time. Therefore, for a fixed threshold t , the time complexity for the computations approximates $O(m)$.

Each share is a (x, y) pair, with $|x| = 32$ and $|y| = \kappa$ bits, resulting in an overhead of 20 and 36 bytes per record sent to the collector for $\kappa = 128$ and $\kappa = 256$, respectively.

The total runtime across experiments exhibited a low RSD, and, hence, a high predictability; ranging from 0.3% to 3.6% for $m \geq 2^{18}$.

7.5 Practical applicability

Our results demonstrate the practical feasibility of the proposed solution in the targeted use cases, specifically for input set sizes up to $m \leq 2^{24}$, small payloads, a threshold t that is typically $1000 \approx 2^{10}$, and rarely more than three data providers.

The application was developed as a modular and deployable product, with crypto-agility in mind (e.g., enabling easy replacement of

the OKVS or PRP implementation), which may affect performance. While the implementation prioritizes maintainability and flexibility over low-level optimization, further code level refinements may still yield additional efficiency gains in terms of computations and memory usage.

The LetheLink implementation supports secure storage of 1) locally generated and calculated secret data, 2) received messages, and 3) state information (i.e., which messages have been scheduled, sent, received, and acknowledged). This feature facilitates crash recovery for individual clients, although it was disabled during the performance evaluation. Importantly, the secure storage of secret data also enables longitudinal studies, allowing data providers to submit multiple observations over time for the same set of citizens. This can be done without rerunning the entire protocol, thereby improving efficiency and usability in real-world deployments.

8 Conclusion & Future Work

In this paper, we presented a new labeled D-PSI protocol supporting encrypted payload and pseudonymization. A collector without input is the only receiver of the intersection, while the data providers do not learn any information about the data of other providers, nor the intersection. The core SIKa protocol, a composable building block, is proven secure against semi-honest colluding data providers and a non-colluding semi-honest collector. It is suitable for the deployment in the existing infrastructure of a trusted party in charge of collecting, linking and pseudonymizing the data, that seeks in reducing its risks and aims at a more privacy-friendly solution.

The source code for the LetheLink application and its protocols, including the possibility to run performance tests, as well as detailed measurements of the conducted experiments, have been made available online [8]. The computational performance is practical even for very large data sets and the network communication amount is limited.

For *future work*, multiple extensions can be created in order to further enhance the usability of our solution. The protocol can be extended to support **k-anonymity** on attributes in the result. The scientific board may impose **post-processing** steps to be performed by the collector before the data is made available to the researcher. **Selective identification** may be required. For instance, in case the results indicate that a particular citizen has committed fraud, or has a risk to develop a medical condition. **Citizen transparency**, which may be a legal requirement [48], could enable citizens to learn in which projects they are involved.

Finally, the current solution returns the intersection of all input data sets. In some scenarios, however, it is desirable to combine data of multiple sets preserving unmatched records of one or more input sets (i.e., outer joins). The current core protocol prevents this, as only when all parties have a matching identifier linking is possible.

Acknowledgements

The authors used AI-based tools, including OpenAI ChatGPT, to correct typos, grammatical errors, and awkward phrasing throughout the paper.

References

- [1] Github repository - efficient private set intersection based on VOLE. <https://github.com/visa-Research/volepsi>, 2022.

- [2] Aydin Abadi, Changyu Dong, Steven J. Murdoch, and Sotirios Terzis. Multi-party updatable delegated private set intersection. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2022.
- [3] Aydin Abadi, Sotirios Terzis, and Changyu Dong. O-PSI: delegated private set intersection on outsourced datasets. In *30th IFIP International Conference on ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection (SEC)*, 2015.
- [4] Aydin Abadi, Sotirios Terzis, and Changyu Dong. VD-PSI: verifiable delegated private set intersection on outsourced private datasets. In *20th International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2016.
- [5] Aydin Abadi, Sotirios Terzis, Roberto Metere, and Changyu Dong. Efficient delegated private set intersection on outsourced private datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 16(4):608–624, 2019.
- [6] Amirhossein Adavoudi Jolfaei, Hamid Mala, and Maryam Zarezadeh. EO-PSI-CA: Efficient outsourced private set intersection cardinality. *J. Inf. Secur. Appl.*, 65(C), March 2022.
- [7] Mohammad Ali, Javad Mohajeri, Mohammad-Reza Sadeghi, and Ximeng Liu. Attribute-based fine-grained access control for outsourced private set intersection computation. *Information Sciences*, 536:222–243, October 2020.
- [8] Anonymized. Lethelink git repository. <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/lethelink-2025-8958/>.
- [9] Saikrishna Badrinarayanan, Peihan Miao, Srinivasan Raghuraman, and Peter Rindal. Multi-party threshold private set intersection with sublinear communication. In *IACR International Conference on Public-Key Cryptography (PKC)*, 2021. 10.1007/978-3-030-75248-4_13.
- [10] Ash Bay, Zekeriya Erkin, Jaap-Henk Hoepman, Simona Samardjiska, and Jelle Vos. Practical multi-party private set intersection protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 17, 2021. 10.1109/TIFS.2021.3118879.
- [11] Amos Beimel. Secret-sharing schemes: A survey. In Yeow Meng Chee, Zhenbo Guo, San Ling, Fengjing Shao, Yuansheng Tang, Huaxiong Wang, and Chaoping Xing, editors, *Coding and Cryptology*, pages 11–46, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 10.1007/978-3-642-20901-7_2.
- [12] Aner Ben-Efraim, Olga Nissenbaum, Eran Omri, and Anat Paskin-Cherniavsky. PSimple: Practical multiparty maliciously-secure private set intersection. In *ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (ASIACCS)*, 2022. 10.1145/3488932.3523254.
- [13] Alexander Bienstock, Sarvar Patel, Joon Young Seo, and Kevin Yeo. Near-optimal oblivious key-value stores for efficient PSI, PSU and volume-hiding multi-maps. Alexander Bienstock, Sarvar Patel, Joon Young Seo, and Kevin Yeo. Batch PIR and labeled PSI with oblivious ciphertext compression. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, 2024.
- [14] George R. Blakley. Safeguarding cryptographic keys. In *Proceedings of the 1979 AFIPS National Computer Conference*, volume 48, pages 313–317, June 1979. 10.1109/MARK.1979.8817296.
- [15] Anrin Chakraborti, Giulia Fanti, and Michael K. Reiter. Distance-aware private set intersection. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, 2023.
- [16] Nishanth Chandran, Nishka Dasgupta, Divya Gupta, Sai Lakshmi Bhavana Obbattu, Sruthi Sekar, and Akash Shah. Efficient linear multiparty PSI and extensions to circuit/quorum PSI. New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Nishanth Chandran, Divya Gupta, and Akash Shah. Circuit-PSI with linear complexity via relaxed batch OPPRF. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2022:353–372, 01 2022.
- [18] Hao Chen, Zhicong Huang, Kim Laine, and Peter Rindal. Labeled PSI from fully homomorphic encryption with malicious security. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2018.
- [19] Lichao Chen, Zhanli Li, Zhenhua Chen, and Yaru Liu. Two Anti-quantum Attack Protocols for Secure Multiparty Computation. In Huanguo Zhang, Bo Zhao, and Fei Yan, editors, *Trusted Computing and Information Security*, pages 338–359, Singapore, 2019. Springer.
- [20] Kelong Cong, Radames Cruz Moreno, Mariana Botelho da Gama, Wei Dai, Ilia Iliashenko, Kim Laine, and Michael Rosenberg. Labeled PSI from homomorphic encryption with reduced computation and communication. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2021.
- [21] Changyu Dong, Liqun Chen, Jan Camenisch, and Giovanni Russello. Fair private set intersection with a semi-trusted arbiter. In *27th IFIP Conference on Data and Applications Security and Privacy (DBSec)*, 2013.
- [22] Changyu Dong, Liqun Chen, and Zikai Wen. When private set intersection meets big data: An efficient and scalable protocol. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security*, CCS '13, page 789–800, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. 10.1145/2508859.2516701.
- [23] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy: A survey of results. In Manindra Agrawal, Dingzhu Du, Zhenhua Duan, and Angsheng Li, editors, *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, pages 1–19, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4_1.
- [24] Daniel Morales Escalera, Isaac Agudo, and Javier López. Private set intersection: A systematic literature review. *Computer Science Reviews*, 49:100567, 2023.
- [25] Michael J. Freedman, Carmit Hazay, Kobbi Nissim, and Benny Pinkas. Efficient set intersection with simulation-based security. *Journal of Cryptology*, 29(1), 2016. 10.1007/s00145-014-9190-0.
- [26] Gayathri Garimella, Benny Pinkas, Mike Rosulek, Ni Trieu, and Avishay Yanai. Oblivious key-value stores and amplification for private set intersection. In Tal Malkin and Chris Peikert, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2021*, pages 395–425, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-030-84245-1_14.
- [27] Carmit Hazay and Muthuramakrishnan Venkatasubramanian. Scalable multiparty private set-intersection. In *IACR International Workshop on Public Key Cryptography (PKC)*, 2017. 10.1007/978-3-662-54365-8_8.
- [28] Xi He, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Cheryl J. Flynn, and Divesh Srivastava. Composing differential privacy and secure computation: A case study on scaling private record linkage. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2017.
- [29] Roi Inbar, Eran Omri, and Benny Pinkas. Efficient scalable multiparty private set-intersection via garbled bloom filters. In *International Conference on Security and Cryptography for Networks (SCN)*, 2018. 10.1007/978-3-319-98113-0_13.
- [30] Seny Kamara, Payman Mohassel, Mariana Raykova, and Saeed Sadeghian. Scaling Private Set Intersection to Billion-Element Sets. In Nicolas Christin and Reihaneh Safavi-Naini, editors, *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 195–215, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014. Springer.
- [31] Ferhat Karakoç and Alptekin Küpcü. Linear Complexity Private Set Intersection for Secure Two-Party Protocols, 2020. Publication info: Published elsewhere. Major revision. CANS 2020.
- [32] Jonathan Katz and Yehuda Lindell. *Introduction to Modern Cryptography*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, 2007. 10.1201/9781420010756.
- [33] Alireza Kavousi, Javad Mohajeri, and Mahmoud Salmasizadeh. Efficient scalable multiparty private set intersection using oblivious PRF. In *International Workshop on Security and Trust Management (STM)*, 2021. 10.1007/978-3-030-91859-0_5.
- [34] Florian Kerschbaum. Collusion-resistant outsourcing of private set intersection. In *ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*, 2012.
- [35] Florian Kerschbaum. Outsourced private set intersection using homomorphic encryption. In *7th ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security (ASIACCS)*, 2012.
- [36] Basit Khurram and Florian Kerschbaum. Sfour: A protocol for cryptographically secure record linkage at scale. In *36th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, 2020.
- [37] Lea Kissner and Dawn Song. Private and threshold set-intersection. Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University, Dept. of Computer Science, 2004. 10.1184/R1/6608612.v1.
- [38] Lea Kissner and Dawn Song. Privacy-preserving set operations. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference (CRYPTO)*, 2005. 10.1007/11535218_15.
- [39] Vladimir Kolesnikov, Naor Matania, Benny Pinkas, Mike Rosulek, and Ni Trieu. Practical multi-party private set intersection from symmetric-key techniques. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2017. 10.1145/3133956.3134065.
- [40] Phi Hung Le, Samuel Ranellucci, and S. Dov Gordon. Two-party Private Set Intersection with an Untrusted Third Party, 2019. Publication info: Published elsewhere. Minor revision. ACM CCS 2019.
- [41] Han Liang, Zhenhua Liu, Baocang Wang, Wenxin Wang, Yujing Yuan, and Tao Liang. Practical Third-Party Private Set Intersection Protocol from Homomorphic Encryption. In Biwen Chen, Xinwen Fu, and Min Huang, editors, *Frontiers in Cyber Security*, pages 44–61, Singapore, 2024. Springer Nature.
- [42] Rasoul Akhavan Mahdavi, Thomas Humphries, Bailey Kacsmar, Simeon Krastnikov, Nils Lukas, John A Premkumar, Masoumeh Shafieinejad, Simon Oya, Florian Kerschbaum, and Erik-Oliver Blass. Practical over-threshold multi-party private set intersection. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC)*, 2020. 10.1145/3427228.3427267.
- [43] Catherine A. Meadows. A more efficient cryptographic matchmaking protocol for use in the absence of a continuously available third party. In *7th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*, 1986. 10.1109/SP.1986.10022.
- [44] Atsuko Miyaji, Kazuhisa Nakasho, and Shohei Nishida. Privacy-Preserving Integration of Medical Data. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 41(3):37, January 2017.
- [45] Swiss Academy of Humanities, Social Science (SAGW), and Swiss Academies. Accessing and linking data for research in switzerland. <https://linkhub.ch/report/>. (visited on 07/06/2021).
- [46] Mahdi Mahdavi Oliaei, Mohammad Hassan Ameri, Javad Mohajeri, and Mohammad Reza Aref. A Verifiable Delegated Set Intersection without pairing. In *2017 Iranian Conference on Electrical Engineering (ICEE)*, pages 2047–2051, May 2017.
- [47] David Pelloquin, Michael DiMaio, Barbara Bieri, and Mark Barnes. Disruptive and avoidable: GDPR challenges to secondary research uses of data. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, 28(6):697–705, 2020. 10.1038/s41431-020-0596-x.
- [48] Benny Pinkas, Mike Rosulek, Ni Trieu, and Avishay Yanai. PSI from PaXoS: Fast, malicious private set intersection. In Anne Canteaut and Yuval Ishai, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2020*, pages 739–767, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-030-45724-2_25.

- [50] Benny Pinkas, Thomas Schneider, Oleksandr Tkachenko, and Avishay Yanai. Efficient Circuit-Based PSI with Linear Communication. In Yuval Ishai and Vincent Rijmen, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2019*, pages 122–153, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [51] Shuo Qiu, Zekun Dai, Daren Zha, Zheng Zhang, and Yanan Liu. PPSI: Practical private set intersection over large-scale datasets. In *2019 IEEE SmartWorld, Ubiquitous Intelligence & Computing, Advanced & Trusted Computing, Scalable Computing & Communications, Cloud & Big Data Computing, Internet of People and Smart City Innovation (SmartWorld/SCALCOM/UIC/ATC/CBDCom/IOP/SCI)*, pages 1249–1254, August 2019.
- [52] Srinivasan Raghuraman and Peter Rindal. Blazing fast PSI from improved OKVS and subfield VOLE. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2022. 10.1145/3548606.3560658.
- [53] Sara Ramezani, Tommi Meskanen, and Valtteri Niemi. Multi-party private set operations with an external decider. In Ken Barker and Kambiz Ghazinour, editors, *Data and Applications Security and Privacy XXXV*, pages 117–135, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [54] Leonid Reyzin. Arithmetic operations and polynomial interpolation over $GF(2^{128})$ and $GF(2^{192})$ in Java. <https://github.com/reyzin/GF2t/>.
- [55] Peter Rindal and Philipp Schoppmann. VOLE-PSI: fast OPRF and circuit-PSI from vector-OLE. In *40th International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques (EUROCRYPT)*, 2021. 10.1007/978-3-030-77886-6_31.
- [56] Ou Ruan, Xiongbo Huang, and Hao Mao. An Efficient Private Set Intersection Protocol for the Cloud Computing Environments. In *2020 IEEE 6th Intl Conference on Big Data Security on Cloud (BigDataSecurity), IEEE Intl Conference on High Performance and Smart Computing, (HPSC) and IEEE Intl Conference on Intelligent Data and Security (IDS)*, pages 254–259, May 2020.
- [57] Adi Shamir. How to share a secret. *Commun. ACM*, 22(11):612–613, November 1979. 10.1145/359168.359176.
- [58] Shantanu Sharma, Yin Li, Sharad Mehrotra, Nisha Panwar, Peeyush Gupta, and Dhruvajyoti Ghosh. Prism: Privacy-Preserving and Verifiable Set Computation Over Multi-Owner Secret Shared Outsourced Databases. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 21(3):1355–1371, May 2024. Publisher: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.
- [59] Sebastian Stammel, Tobias Kussel, Philipp Schoppmann, Florian Stampe, Galina Tremper, Stefan Katzenbeisser, Kay Hamacher, and Martin Lablans. Mainzliste secureepilinker (mainzel): privacy-preserving record linkage using secure multi-party computation. *Bioinformatics*, 38(6):1657–1668, 2022.
- [60] Shintaro Terada and Kazuki Yoneyama. Improved Verifiable Delegated Private Set Intersection. In *2018 International Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications (ISITA)*, pages 520–524, October 2018.
- [61] Erkam Uzun, Simon P. Chung, Vladimir Kolesnikov, Alexandra Boldyreva, and Wenke Lee. Fuzzy labeled private set intersection with applications to private real-time biometric search. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, 2021.
- [62] Jelle Vos, Mauro Conti, and Zekeriya Erkin. Fast multi-party private set operations in the star topology from secure ANDs and ORs. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2022. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/721>.
- [63] Qiang Wang, Fu-cai Zhou, Tie-min Ma, and Zi-feng Xu. Faster fog-aided private set intersection with integrity preserving. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering*, 19(12):1558–1568, December 2018.
- [64] Qiang Wang, Fucai Zhou, Jian Xu, and Su Peng. Tag-Based Verifiable Delegated Set Intersection Over Outsourced Private Datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*, 10(2):1201–1214, April 2022. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing.
- [65] Xu An Wang, Fatos Xhafa, Xiaoshuang Luo, Shuaiwei Zhang, and Yong Ding. A privacy-preserving fuzzy interest matching protocol for friends finding in social networks. *Soft Computing*, 22(8):2517–2526, April 2018.
- [66] Yuanhao Wang, Qiong Huang, Hongbo Li, Meiyang Xiao, Sha Ma, and Willy Susilo. Private Set Intersection With Authorization Over Outsourced Encrypted Datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 16:4050–4062, 2021. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security.
- [67] Zhusheng Wang, Karim Banawan, and Sennur Ulukus. Multi-party private set intersection: An information-theoretic approach. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2(1), 2021. 10.1109/JSAIT.2021.3057597.
- [68] Ruidi Wei and Florian Kerschbaum. Cryptographically secure private record linkage using locality-sensitive hashing. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 17(2):79–91, 2023.
- [69] Xiaoyuan Yang, Xiaoshuang Luo, Xu An Wang, and Shuaiwei Zhang. Improved outsourced private set intersection protocol based on polynomial interpolation. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 30(1):e4329, 2018. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpe.4329>.
- [70] Chong-Qiang Ye, Jian Li, Tianyu Ye, and Xiaoyu Chen. Quantum Scheme for Private Set Intersection and Union Cardinality based on Quantum Homomorphic Encryption, December 2024. arXiv:2412.01032 [quant-ph].
- [71] Foo Yee Yeo and Jason H. M. Ying. Third-Party Private Set Intersection, 2023. Publication info: Published elsewhere. 2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT).
- [72] Foo Yee Yeo and Jason H. M. Ying. A Round-Optimal Near-Linear Third-Party Private Set Intersection Protocol, 2024. Publication info: Preprint.
- [73] Moti Yung. From mental poker to core business: why and how to deploy secure computation protocols? In *21st ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2015. 10.1145/2810103.2812701.
- [74] En Zhang, Fenghua Li, Ben Niu, and Yanchao Wang. Server-aided private set intersection based on reputation. *Information Sciences*, 387:180–194, May 2017.
- [75] En Zhang, Feng-Hao Liu, Qiqi Lai, Ganggang Jin, and Yu Li. Efficient multi-party private set intersection against malicious adversaries. In *ACM Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW)*, 2019. 10.1145/3338466.3358927.