

Asymptotically Ideal Hierarchical Secret Sharing Based on CRT for Integer Ring

Jian Ding^{1,2}, Cheng Wang², Hongju Li^{1,3}, Cheng Shu², Haifeng Yu²

¹School of Mathematics and Big Data, Chaohu University, Hefei 238024, China

²School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hefei University, Hefei 230000, China

³School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China

Abstract: In Shamir’s secret sharing scheme, all participants possess equal privileges. However, in many practical scenarios, it is often necessary to assign different levels of authority to different participants. To address this requirement, Hierarchical Secret Sharing (HSS) schemes were developed, which partitioned all participants into multiple subsets and assigned a distinct privilege level to each. Existing Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT)-based HSS schemes benefit from flexible share sizes, but either exhibit security flaws or have an information rate less than $\frac{1}{2}$. In this work, we propose a disjunctive HSS scheme and a conjunctive HSS scheme by using the CRT for integer ring and one-way functions. Both schemes are asymptotically ideal and are proven to be secure.

Keywords: disjunctive hierarchical secret sharing, conjunctive hierarchical secret sharing, asymptotically ideal secret sharing, Chinese Remainder Theorem

1 Introduction

Secret Sharing (SS) [1, 2] is a method for sharing a secret among a group of participants. It typically consists of two phases: the share generation phase and the secret reconstruction phase. In the share generation phase, a dealer divides the secret into multiple shares and securely distributes each share to its designated participant. In the secret reconstruction phase, any authorized subset can reconstruct the secret by gathering their shares together, while any unauthorized subset cannot. The collection of all authorized subsets is known as the *access structure*. An SS scheme is termed *perfect* if any given unauthorized subset gains no information about the secret. An SS scheme is said to be *ideal* if it is perfect and has an information rate 1. It is referred to as *asymptotically ideal* if it is asymptotically perfect and its information rate approaches 1 as the secret size increases.

This research was in part supported by Projects of Chaohu University under Grant KYQD-202220, Grant 2024cxttd147 and Grant kj22zdjsxk01, University Natural Science Research Project of Anhui Province under Grant 2024AH051324.

Corresponding author: Jian Ding

E-mail address: 058071@chu.edu.cn (J. Ding)

The (t, n) -threshold scheme is an SS scheme such that any subset of at least t participants is authorized, while any subset with $(t - 1)$ or fewer participants is unauthorized. In a (t, n) -threshold scheme, all participants possess identical privileges, but in many real-world scenarios, it is often necessary to assign differing privilege levels to different participants. To address this need, Simmons [3] introduced the hierarchical threshold access structure in 1988, which partitions the participants into multiple disjoint subsets and assigns a distinct privilege level to each. More precisely, let \mathcal{P} be the set of all participants, which are divided into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. Denote by t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m be a sequence of thresholds such that $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m$. By using geometric methods, Simmons [3] constructed an SS scheme with access structure

$$\Gamma_1 = \{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : \exists \ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| \geq t_{\ell}\},$$

which is called a Disjunctive Hierarchical Secret Sharing (DHSS) scheme. However, this scheme is not ideal and requires the dealer to verify the non-singularity of many matrices. Tassa [4] introduced the Conjunctive Hierarchical Secret Sharing (CHSS) scheme, which is an SS scheme with access structure

$$\Gamma_2 = \{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : |\mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| \geq t_{\ell} \text{ for all } \ell \in [m]\}.$$

Moreover, an ideal CHSS scheme and an ideal DHSS scheme were proposed by using Birkhoff interpolation, and the dealers were required to check many matrices. Chen et al. [5] constructed ideal CHSS and DHSS schemes based on polymatroids, and the dealers were required exponential time to find a specific parameters via special algorithms.

In order to reduce the dealer's computational complexity from exponential time to polynomial time, Yuan et al. [6] constructed a CHSS scheme by using linear homogeneous recurrence relations and one-way functions, which is not ideal due to the use of one-way functions, and many values were published. The Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT) provides the flexibility to assign shares of varying sizes to different participants. Harn et al. [7] constructed a DHSS scheme based on the CRT for integer ring, which was insecure pointed by Ersoy et al. [8]. Furthermore, Ersoy et al. [8] proposed a new DHSS scheme and a new CHSS scheme by using the CRT for integer ring and hash functions. Their information rates were smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$. Tiplea et al. [9] proposed an asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme and an asymptotically ideal CHSS scheme by using the CRT for integer ring, achieving information rates approaching 1. Recently, Yang et al. [10] constructed an ideal DHSS scheme by using the CRT for polynomial rings. However, all these CRT-based ideal or asymptotically ideal DHSS schemes and CHSS schemes [9, 10] have been shown to be insecure in our other work.

Our contributions. By using the CRT for integer ring and one-way functions, we construct two asymptotically ideal hierarchical secret sharing schemes with flexible share sizes. More precisely, we make the following contributions:

- We construct an asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme, which has flexible share sizes, but the ideal DHSS schemes of Tassa et al. [4] and Cheng et al.[5] cannot. Compared with the CRT-based DHSS schemes of Harn et al. [7], Ersoy et al. [8], Tiplea et al. [9] and Yang et al. [10], our scheme is a secure and asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme (See Table 1).

Table 1. Disjunctive hierarchical secret sharing schemes.

Schemes	Secure	Accommodate flexible share sizes	Perfectness	Information rate ρ
[4]	Yes	No	Yes	$\rho = 1$
[5]	Yes	No	Yes	$\rho = 1$
[7]	No	Yes	No	$\rho < 1$
[9]	No	Yes	No	$\rho < 1$
[10]	No	Yes	No	$\rho = 1$
[8]	Yes	Yes	Asymptotic	$\rho < \frac{1}{2}$
Our scheme	Yes	Yes	Asymptotic	Approaches 1

- We construct an asymptotically ideal CHSS scheme, which has flexible share sizes, but the ideal CHSS schemes of Tassa et al. [4], Cheng et al.[5] and the asymptotically ideal CHSS scheme of Yuan et al. [6] cannot. Compared with the CRT-based CHSS schemes of Tiplea et al. [9] and Ersoy et al. [8], our scheme is a secure and asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme (See Table 2).

Table 2. Conjunctive hierarchical secret sharing schemes.

Schemes	Secure	Accommodate flexible share sizes	Perfectness	Information rate ρ
[4]	Yes	No	Yes	$\rho = 1$
[5]	Yes	No	Yes	$\rho = 1$
[6]	Yes	No	Asymptotic	$\rho = 1$
[9]	No	Yes	No	Approaches 1
[8]	Yes	Yes	Asymptotic	$\rho < \frac{1}{2}$
Our scheme	Yes	Yes	Asymptotic	Approaches 1

Paper organization. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the necessary preliminaries. Section 3 presents the construction of our DHSS

scheme, along with its security analysis. In section 4, we construct a CHSS Scheme and provide its security analysis. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

This section will introduce the relevant mathematical tools required in this paper as well as the related concepts of secret sharing.

2.1 Relevant mathematical tools

Lemma 1 (CRT for integer ring, [11]). *Let m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n be positive integers that are pairwise coprime. Given any integers x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and a system of congruences*

$$\begin{cases} x \equiv x_1 \pmod{m_1}, \\ x \equiv x_2 \pmod{m_2}, \\ \vdots \\ x \equiv x_n \pmod{m_n}, \end{cases}$$

it holds that

$$x \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i M_i x_i \pmod{M},$$

where $M = \prod_{i=1}^n m_i$, $M_i = \frac{M}{m_i}$, and $\lambda_i \equiv M_i^{-1} \pmod{m_i}$. If the integer x satisfies $0 \leq x < M$, the solution is unique, denoted by

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i M_i x_i \pmod{M}.$$

Definition 1 (k -compact sequences of co-primes [9]). *We assume $L = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ is sequences of co-primes, i.e $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1, 0 \leq i < j \leq n, i \neq j$. The sequence L is called (k, θ) -compact if it satisfies*

(i) $m_0 < m_1 < \dots < m_n$.

(ii) $km_0 < m_i < km_0 + m_0^\theta$, where $k \geq 1$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ are real numbers, $i \in [n]$.

L is classified as k -compact if it fulfills the (k, θ) -compactness criterion for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

Remark 1. *A sequences of co-primes $L = \{m_0, m_1^1, \dots, m_{n_1}^1, \dots, m_1^m, \dots, m_{n_m}^m\}$ is 1-compact if and only if all sub-sequences $L_\ell = \{m_0, m_1^1, \dots, m_{n_1}^1, \dots, m_1^\ell, \dots, m_{n_\ell}^\ell\}$ is 1-compact, where $\ell \in [m]$*

Remark 2. k -compact sequences of co-primes can be efficiently generated; see Section 5 of scheme[9] for the specific algorithm.

2.2 Secret sharing

Definition 2 (Secret sharing scheme). Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n\}$ be a set of n participants. A secret sharing scheme consists of a share generation phase and a secret reconstruction phase, as follows.

- *Share Generation Phase:* We assume \mathcal{S} is the secret space. For any secret $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the dealer distribute shares to participants using a share distribution algorithm

$$\text{SHARE: } \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{R} \mapsto \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}_n,$$

where \mathcal{R} is a set of random symbol set, and \mathcal{S}_i is the share space of the participant P_i .

- *Secret Reconstruction Phase.* Participants in any authorized set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ can use their shares to reconstruct the secret through the secret reconstruction algorithm

$$\text{RECON: } \prod_{P_i \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{S}_i \mapsto \mathcal{S}.$$

Conversely, any unauthorized set cannot reconstruct the secret.

Denote by $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $[N_1, N_2] = \{N_1, N_1 + 1, \dots, N_2\}$, where n, N_1, N_2 be positive integers such that $N_1 < N_2$. In this work, the index i conventionally denotes the i -th participant P_i . Consequently, the set $[n]$ represents the complete participant set \mathcal{P} . A secret sharing scheme is perfect security if any unauthorized subset gains no information about the secret.

Definition 3 (Information rate, [12]). The information rate quantifies the efficiency of a secret sharing scheme, defined as:

$$\rho = \frac{\log_2 |\mathcal{S}|}{\max_{i \in [n]} \log_2 |\mathcal{S}_i|},$$

where $|\mathcal{S}|$ is the number of elements in the secret space, and $|\mathcal{S}_i|$ is the number of elements in the share space of the i -th participant.

The information rate ρ of any perfect secret sharing scheme is bounded above by 1 ($\rho \leq 1$). If a perfect secret sharing scheme has information rate one, it is said to be ideal.

We now introduce essential Shannon entropy. For discrete random variables \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , $H(\mathbf{X})$ signifies the Shannon entropy of \mathbf{X} . The conditional entropy of \mathbf{X} given \mathbf{Y} is denoted $H(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})$.

Definition 4 (Asymptotically ideal hierarchical secret sharing scheme, [13]). *For a hierarchical secret sharing (HSS) scheme with the secret space \mathcal{S} and share spaces $\mathcal{S}_i, i \in [n]$, it is said to be asymptotically ideal if the following asymptotic perfectness and asymptotic maximum information rate are satisfied.*

- *Asymptotic perfectness. For all $\epsilon_1 > 0$, there is a positive integer σ_1 such that for all $\mathcal{B} \notin \Gamma$ and $|\mathcal{S}| > \sigma_1$, the loss entropy*

$$\Delta(|\mathcal{S}|) = H(\mathbf{S}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{B}}) \leq \epsilon_1,$$

where $H(\mathbf{S}) \neq 0$, and $\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{B}}$ are random variables corresponding to the secret and the knowledge of \mathcal{B} , respectively.

- *Asymptotic maximum information rate. For all $\epsilon_2 > 0$, there is a positive integer σ_2 such that for all $\mathcal{B} \notin \Gamma$ and $|\mathcal{S}| > \sigma_2$, it holds that*

$$\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} H(\mathbf{S}_i)}{H(\mathbf{S})} \leq 1 + \epsilon_2.$$

The (t, n) -threshold secret sharing scheme[15] by Asmuth and Bloom, based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem, ranks among the most widely implemented schemes.

Definition 5 (Asmuth-Bloom's secret sharing scheme, [15]). *Let m_0 be a prime. For a secret $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_0}$. Asmuth-Bloom's secret sharing scheme is a (t, n) -threshold scheme with the following two phases.*

- *Share Generation Phase: The dealer chooses an increasing sequence of pairwise co-prime integers $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_n$ satisfy the following conditions:*

(i) $\deg(m_0, m_i) = 1, i \in [n]$

(ii) $m_0 \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i < \prod_{i=1}^t m_i$ (The Asmuth-Bloom constraint)

The dealer then chooses a integer α such that $0 < y = s + \alpha m_0 < \prod_{i=1}^t m_i$. The dealer computes $s_i = y \pmod{m_i}, i \in [n]$, and distributes each share s_i to the i -th participant P_i .

- *Secret Reconstruction Phase: Given any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [n]$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{A}| \geq t$, participants from \mathcal{A} reconstruct the secret s with their shares $s_i = y \pmod{m_i}, i \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $y < \prod_{i=1}^t m_i < \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}} m_i$, based on Lemma 1, they can compute $y = s + \alpha m_0$ and $s = y \pmod{m_0}$*

The Asmuth-Bloom constraint ensures that any set of fewer than t participants cannot recover the secret. However, this scheme is only asymptotically perfect (as detailed in [13]), due to its reliance on the Chinese Remainder Theorem. Furthermore, its information rate is strictly less than 1. To address this limitation, we introduce k -compact sequences of co-primes.

Remark 3. *When m_0 is sufficiently large, the k -compact co-prime sequence L satisfies the Asmuth-Bloom constraint. Let $L = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ be a k -compact sequences of co-primes. First, we know $(km_0)^t > m_0(km_0 + m_0^\theta)^{t-1}$ for m_0 is sufficiently large. Second, for $i \in [n]$, $km_0 < m_i < km_0 + m_0^\theta$. Finally, $m_0 \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i < m_0(km_0 + m_0^\theta)^{t-1} < (km_0)^t < \prod_{i=1}^t m_i$. Therefore, the sequence L satisfies the Asmuth-Bloom constraint.*

Definition 6 (Disjunctive hierarchical secret sharing scheme, [3]). *The set \mathcal{P} can be divided into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{P} = \cup_{\ell=1}^m \mathcal{P}_\ell, \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\ell_2} = \emptyset \text{ for any } 1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq m.$$

A Disjunctive Hierarchical Secret Sharing (DHSS) scheme associated with a strictly increasing threshold sequence $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m \leq n$ satisfies the following properties:

- *Correctness. Any authorized set $\mathcal{A} \in \Gamma$ can reconstruct the secret, Γ is the access structure defined as:*

$$\Gamma = \{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : \exists \ell \in [m] \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| \geq t_\ell\}.$$

- *Privacy. Any given $\mathcal{B} \notin \Gamma$ does not get any information about the secret.*

A DHSS scheme attains ideal status if and only if it is perfect and information rate achieves one ($\rho = 1$).

Definition 7 (Conjunctive hierarchical secret sharing scheme, [4]). *The setting is the same as that of the DHSS Definition 6. Only the access structure Γ is different, as defined below:*

$$\Gamma = \{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : |\mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| \geq t_\ell \text{ for } \forall \ell \in [m]\}.$$

3 A novel asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme

In this section, we construct a hierarchical secret sharing scheme for disjunctive access structures. The construction is based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem over the ring of integers and one-way functions. Our scheme is given in subsection 3.1, and we analyze its security in subsection 3.2.

3.1 Our scheme 1

Consider a set \mathcal{P} of n participants partitioned into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. Let $n_\ell = |\mathcal{P}_\ell|$ and $N_\ell = \sum_{w=1}^\ell n_w$ for $\ell \in [m]$. For $\ell \in [m]$, t_ℓ define as the threshold for the subsets $\bigcup_{w=1}^\ell \mathcal{P}_w$. The threshold sequence satisfies $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m$ and $t_\ell \leq N_\ell$. Our scheme consists of two phases: the share generation phase and the secret reconstruction phase.

Share Generation Phase.

- The dealer first generates a publicly co-prime sequence, $L = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n\}$. The dealer assign each m_i to a participant i , $i \in [n]$. Let $L_\ell = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{N_\ell}\}$, $\ell \in [m]$ denotes the sub-sequence of L such that the following conditions are satisfied.
 - (i) m_0 is a big prime and $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$, $0 \leq i < j \leq n$.
 - (ii) $m_0 < m_1 < \dots < m_{N_\ell}$, $\ell \in [m]$.
 - (iii) $km_0 < m_i < km_0 + m_0^\theta$, where $k \geq 1$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ are real numbers, $i \in [N_\ell]$ and $\ell \in [m]$.
- For any given secret $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_0}$, the dealer selects random integers $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$, $i \in [N_{m-1}]$.

The dealer selects integers α_ℓ , $\ell \in [m]$ such that

$$0 \leq y_\ell = s + \alpha_\ell m_0 < m_1 m_2 \dots m_{t_\ell}$$

The dealer sends each share s_i to the i -th participant, where

$$s_i = \begin{cases} c_i, & \text{if } i \in [N_{m-1}], \\ y_m \pmod{m_i}, & \text{if } i \in [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

- The dealer selects m publicly known distinct one-way functions $h_1(\cdot), h_2(\cdot), \dots, h_m(\cdot)$. These functions $h_m(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ for $i \in [n], \ell \in [m]$. For any $i \in [N_{m-1}]$, there is an integer $\ell_1 \in [m-1]$ such that $i \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell_1}$. For all $\ell \in [\ell_1, m]$, the dealer computes and publishes

$$w_i^{(\ell)} = (y_\ell - h_\ell(s_i, \ell)) \pmod{m_i}.$$

Secret Reconstruction Phase. For any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^\ell \mathcal{P}_w)$, $|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}| \geq t_\ell$ for some $\ell \in [m]$, participants of \mathcal{A} first compute

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}, & \text{if } \ell \in [m-1], i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \subseteq [N_\ell], \\ h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

Then, they based on CRT for the ring of integers compute

$$y_\ell = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}},$$

and reconstruct the secret $s = y_\ell \pmod{m_0}$, where $M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i$, $M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}/m_i$, $\lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \equiv M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}^{-1} \pmod{m_i}$.

3.2 Security analysis of our scheme

We will prove the correctness, asymptotic perfectness and asymptotic maximum information rate of our scheme in this subsection.

Theorem 1 (Correctness). *Any authorized subset*

$$\mathcal{A} \in \left\{ \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : \exists \ell \in [m] \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A} \cap \left(\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w \right)| \geq t_\ell \right\}.$$

can reconstruct the secret.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}|}\}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\cup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)$, $|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}| \geq t_\ell$ for some $\ell \in [m]$. We will prove that the all participants in $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$ can reconstruct the secret.

For $i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}]$, each participant needs to compute the required values by using the public one-way function $h_\ell(\cdot)$, the public values m_i , $w_i^{(\ell)} = (y_\ell - h_\ell(s_i, \ell)) \pmod{m_i}$, and their shares s_i . For $i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]$, the participant's operation is straightforward, requiring only the provision of their share. Specifically, participants of $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$ compute

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}, & \text{if } \ell \in [m-1], i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \subseteq [N_\ell], \\ h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

And for $i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$, get the system of congruences

$$y_\ell \equiv s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{m_i}.$$

Since y_ℓ satisfies

$$y_\ell < \prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i \leq \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i,$$

where $|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}| \geq t_\ell$. Based on the CRT for integer ring in Lemma 1, it holds a unique solution that

$$y_\ell \equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}},$$

where $M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i$, $M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}/m_i$ and $\lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \equiv M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}^{-1}(x) \pmod{m_i}$. And they can compute the secret $s = y_\ell \pmod{m_0}$. \square

Now we will prove our scheme is *asymptotic perfectness*.

Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}$ be an unauthorized subset. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{B} \notin \left\{ \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : \exists \ell \in [m] \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A} \cap \left(\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w \right)| \geq t_\ell \right\},$$

such that,

$$|\mathcal{B} \cap \left(\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w \right)| < t_\ell \text{ for all } \ell \in [m].$$

Participants in \mathcal{B} attempt to reconstruct the secret using their shares, one-way functions and all available public information. In other words, for any given secrets $s \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists a tuple $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{G}$ derivable from all share values in set \mathcal{B} and all public values.

Denote by

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m : \text{the conditions (i) to (iv) are satisfied.}\} \quad (1)$$

- Basic Conditions

(i) $0 \leq z_\ell < \prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i$, for all $\ell \in [m]$.

(ii) $z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv \dots \equiv z_m \pmod{m_0}$.

- Share Verification Conditions

(iii) For any $i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}]$, there is an integer $\ell' \in [m-1]$ such that $i \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$. It holds that

$$z_\ell \equiv (w_i^{(\ell)} + h_\ell(s_i, \ell)) \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } \ell \in [\ell', m],$$

namely,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} z_1 \equiv (w_i^{(1)} + h_1(s_i, 1)) \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_1], \\ z_2 \equiv (w_i^{(2)} + h_2(s_i, 2)) \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_2], \\ \vdots \\ z_{m-1} \equiv (w_i^{(m-1)} + h_{m-1}(s_i, m-1)) \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ z_m \equiv (w_i^{(m)} + h_m(s_i, m)) \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}]. \end{array} \right.$$

(iv) For $i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]$, it holds that $z_m \equiv s_i \pmod{m_i}$.

- Public Value Verification Conditions

(v) For any $i \in [N_{m-1}]$ and $i \notin \mathcal{B}$, there is an integer $\ell_3 \in [m]$ such that $i \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell_3}$. There are integers \tilde{s}_i , and $h_\ell(\tilde{s}_i, m) = (z_\ell - w_i^{(\ell)}) \pmod{m_i}$ for all $\ell \in [\ell_3, m]$.

Lemma 2 determines the cardinality of \mathcal{G} . Building on Lemmas 3 and 2, we derive the conditional entropy $H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}})$ and thereby prove the asymptotic perfectness of our scheme in Theorem 2.

Lemma 2. *The cardinality of \mathcal{G} satisfies*

$$|\mathcal{G}| = \gamma_1 Y_1 + \gamma_2 Y_2 + \cdots + \gamma_{2^m} Y_{2^m},$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{2^m} \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \cdots + \gamma_{2^m} = m$, $\mathcal{B}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{B} \cap [N_\ell]$ for $\ell \in [m]$. Denote by

$$Y_q = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \left(\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + a_{q\ell} \right)$$

, $a_{q\ell} \in \{0, 1\}$ for $q \in [2^m]$ and $\ell \in [m]$, and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function.

Proof. For any $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv \cdots \equiv z_m \pmod{m_0}, \\ z_1 \equiv s_i^{(1)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_1], \\ z_2 \equiv s_i^{(2)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_2], \\ \vdots \\ z_{m-1} \equiv s_i^{(m-1)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ z_m \equiv s_i^{(m)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_m]. \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}, & \text{if } \ell \in [m-1], i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_\ell], \\ h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

Since \mathcal{G} satisfies condition (ii), each secret $s \in \mathcal{S}$ yields a unique outcome. Therefore, the cardinality of \mathcal{G} corresponds to all possible combinations of outcomes for the entire set of secrets. For any $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{G}$, it can be formulated as a system

of congruence equations that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv \cdots \equiv z_m \equiv s \pmod{m_0}, \\ z_1 \equiv s_i^{(1)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_1], \\ z_2 \equiv s_i^{(2)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_2], \\ \vdots \\ z_{m-1} \equiv s_i^{(m-1)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ z_m \equiv s_i^{(m)} \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_m]. \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}, & \text{if } \ell \in [m-1], i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_\ell], \\ h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{B} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 1, it holds that

$$z_\ell \equiv \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}}, \ell \in [m]$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)} = \{0\} \cup (\mathcal{B} \cap [N_\ell]) = \{0\} \cup \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}$, $s_0^{(\ell)} = s$, $M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i$, $M_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} = M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}/m_i$,

and $\lambda_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}(x) \equiv M_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}^{-1}(x) \pmod{m_i}$.

Denote by $z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}}$, then

$$z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} < M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i,$$

and

$$z_\ell \equiv z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} \pmod{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}}. \quad (2)$$

That is, there exists a nonnegative integer $k_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}$ such that

$$z_\ell = z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} + k_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}.$$

On the one hand, z_ℓ satisfies the basic conditions $0 \leq z_\ell < \prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i$ in Expression (1). Since $0 \leq z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} < M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}$, it holds that

$$0 \leq k_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} < \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i - z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}}{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}}.$$

Let $\eta_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}$ be the number of all possible $k_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}$, then

$$\eta_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor, & \text{if } z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} \geq \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i \pmod{M} \right)_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}, \\ \left(\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + 1 \right), & \text{if } z_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} < \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i \pmod{M} \right)_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, different choices for nonnegative integer vector $(k_{1, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}}, k_{2, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}} \dots, k_{m, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(m)}})$ correspond to different (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) satisfying $0 \leq z_\ell < \prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i, \ell \in [m]$ and Expression (2), i.e., $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{G}$. This means that for a given secret, the outcome is $\prod_{\ell=1}^m \eta_{\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}}$. We represent this outcome with the variable Y_q .

For the sake of convenience and to avoid confusion, we make the following provisions.

let $\Delta = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{2^m}\}$, where each indexed selection vector $\mathbf{a}_q = (a_{q1}, a_{q2}, \dots, a_{qm})$ satisfies $a_{q\ell} \in \{0, 1\}$ for $q = 1, 2, \dots, 2^m$ and $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Here, $a_{q\ell}$ represents the ℓ -th component of the q -th selection vector \mathbf{a}_q .

Correspondingly, the q -th product term (which can be any arbitrary term in the product set) is defined as

$$Y_q = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \left(\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + a_{q\ell} \right)$$

The set of all product results is then expressed as

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_q \mid q = 1, 2, \dots, 2^m\} = \left\{ \prod_{\ell=1}^m \left(\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + a_{q\ell} \right) \mid q = 1, 2, \dots, 2^m \right\}$$

Notably, the cardinality of the selection vector space Δ is $|\Delta| = 2^m$, as each component $\delta_{q\ell}$ has two independent choices (0 or 1). This implies that the product set \mathcal{Y} contains exactly 2^m distinct terms, and there exists a bijective correspondence between the indexed selection vectors \mathbf{a}_q and the product terms Y_q .

It shows that there are either $\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor$ or $\left(\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + 1 \right)$ possible consistent for each z_ℓ . This mean that there are possibly 2^m scenarios for the candidates about a tuple $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{G}$.

We emphasize that the cardinality of \mathcal{G} is all possible candidates of (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) . Since given a secret $s \in \mathcal{S}$ corresponds to a $Y_q, q \in [2^m]$. Therefore, the number of

secrets corresponding to Y_q is denoted as $\gamma_q, q \in [2^m]$. The cardinality of \mathcal{G} is $|\mathcal{G}| = \gamma_1 Y_1 + \gamma_2 Y_2 + \dots + \gamma_{2^m} Y_{2^m}$, where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{2^m} \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \dots + \gamma_{2^m} = m$. \square

Based on Lemmas 3 and 2, we determine the conditional entropy $H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}})$ and give the proof of the asymptotic perfectness our scheme in Theorem 2.

Lemma 3. *The knowledge of \mathcal{B} is the following conditions (i) to (v) denoted by $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{B}}$. Denote by $\mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}$ the conditions (i) to (iv). For all $\epsilon_1 > 0$, there is a positive integer σ_1 such that for all $|\mathcal{S}| = m_0 > \sigma_1$, it has that*

$$0 < H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{B}}) < \epsilon_1,$$

where $\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{B}}$ are random variables corresponding to $\mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{B}}$, respectively.

Proof. Since the dealer selects the shares s_i (for $i \in [N_{m-1}]$) uniformly at random and the one-way functions $h_{\ell}(\cdot), \ell \in [m]$ are distinct, condition (v) will only reject a candidate tuple $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ with negligible probability, provided the share set $|\mathcal{S}|$ is sufficiently large. Consequently, the entropy difference $H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{B}})$ is negligible for sufficiently large $|\mathcal{S}|$. This completes the proof. \square

According to Lemma 2, for each $\ell \in [m]$, the possible candidate values for z_{ℓ} are either $\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor$ or $\left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right\rfloor + 1$. However, by leveraging the properties of the k -compact co-prime sequence, we can establish the following result: as m_0 tends to infinity, the possible candidate values for z_{ℓ} tends to a fixed constant. We illustrate this by considering the case where $m = 1$ and present Lemma 4.

Lemma 4. *Let the single-layer Asmuth-Bloom (t, n) -threshold scheme be based on a k -compact sequence of co-primes m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n ($k \geq 1$ is an integer). Let $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}} m_i} \right\rfloor$*

be the number of candidate values determined by an unauthorized set \mathcal{B} using both shares and the secret. Then the $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}} m_i} \right\rfloor$ and the $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfy the following piecewise relation:

When $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}} m_i} \right\rfloor = k - 1$, if and only if, for all secrets, the candidate values tends to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} + 1$; if $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}} m_i} \right\rfloor = k$, if and only if, for all secrets, the candidate values tends to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof. This scheme is based on the Asmuth-Bloom's secret sharing scheme framework using a k -compact co-prime sequence. The relevant parameters are provided in Definition 5. For an unauthorized set \mathcal{B} , the system of congruences $y' \equiv y \pmod{m_i, i \in \mathcal{B}}$ is known.

Let $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\lfloor \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}} m_i} \right\rfloor$. First, when the secret is not given, the participants in \mathcal{B} can use Lemma 1 to determine the number of candidate values that are consistent with their shares, denoted as $C_{\mathcal{B}}$. Second, if the secret s is given, then from adversary's perspective, for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the number of consistent y candidates is either $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} + 1$ or $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$. In other words, the entire secret space is partitioned into two subsets: one containing d_1 secrets corresponding to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ possible y candidates, and the other containing $d_2 = m_0 - d_1$ secrets corresponding to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} + 1$ possible y candidates.

According to the division theorem, $C_{\mathcal{B}} = m_0 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{C_{\mathcal{B}}}{m_0} \right\rfloor + d_2 = m_0 \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{B}} + d_2$, where $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} \geq 0$, $0 \leq d_2 < m_0$. Furthermore, based on the property of the k -compact co-prime sequence where $km_0 - (m_0^\theta + 1) < C_{\mathcal{B}} < km_0 + (m_0^\theta + 1)$, the following two scenarios can be derived:

Csae 1: $km_0 - (m_0^\theta + 1) < C_{\mathcal{B}} < km_0$. Then, as m_0 approaches infinity, $\left\lfloor \frac{C_{\mathcal{B}}}{m_0} \right\rfloor = \eta_{\mathcal{B}} = k - 1$.

As $C_{\mathcal{B}} = m_0 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{C_{\mathcal{B}}}{m_0} \right\rfloor + d_2$, we obtain

$$m_0 - (m_0^\theta + 1) < d_2 < m_0$$

which shows that $\frac{d_2}{m_0}$ goes to 1 and d_1 goes to 0 as m_0 goes to infinity (recall that θ is fixed). This is mean that $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\mathcal{B}} = k - 1$, all secrets corresponding to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} + 1$ possible y candidates.

Csae 2: $km_0 \leq C_{\mathcal{B}} < km_0 + (m_0^\theta + 1)$. Then, as m_0 approaches infinity, $\left\lfloor \frac{C_{\mathcal{B}}}{m_0} \right\rfloor = \eta_{\mathcal{B}} = k$. As

$C_{\mathcal{B}} = m_0 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{C_{\mathcal{B}}}{m_0} \right\rfloor + d_2$, we obtain

$$0 \leq d_2 < m_0^\theta + 1$$

which shows that $\frac{d_2}{m_0}$ goes to 0 and $\frac{d_1}{m_0}$ goes to 1 as m_0 goes to infinity (recall that θ is fixed). This is mean that $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\mathcal{B}} = k$, all secrets corresponding to $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ possible y candidates.

In summary, the parameter $C_{\mathcal{B}}$ admits only two possible scenarios. Each corresponds to a distinct limit value $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ and a specific case for the parameter $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$. This relationship is a one-to-one correspondence. □

We first prove that

Lemma 5. For every $\ell \in [m]$,

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} = k.$$

Proof. Base case: For $\ell = 1$, the left-hand side is

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_1} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}} m_i} = \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_1}{m_0} \times \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_2}{m_{i_1}} \times \cdots \times \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_{t_1}}{m_{i_{t_1-1}}}$$

On one hand, according to the definition of k -compact sequences of co-primes, any m_i and m_j tends to be the same as m_0 goes to infinity, $i, j \in [n]$. $km_0 < m_i, m_j < km_0 + m_0^\theta$, where $k \geq 1, \theta \in (0, 1)$. Then $\frac{km_0}{km_0 + m_0^\theta} \leq \frac{m_i}{m_j} \leq \frac{km_0 + m_0^\theta}{km_0}$. $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{km_0}{km_0 + m_0^\theta} = \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{km_0}{km_0 + m_0^\theta} = 1$, at this time, m_0^θ is a higher-order infinitesimal of m_0 (recall that θ is fixed). Therefore, measured using the squeeze theorem, $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_i}{m_j} = 1$.

On the other hand, $k < \frac{m_1}{m_0} < k + m_0^{\theta-1}$, where $k \geq 1, \theta \in (0, 1)$. We can easily get $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} k = \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} k + m_0^{\theta-1} = k$. According to the squeeze theorem, there is $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_1}{m_0} = k$. Now, the left-hand side is

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_1} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}} m_i} = \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_1}{m_0} \times \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_2}{m_{i_1}} \times \cdots \times \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_{t_1}}{m_{i_{t_1-1}}} = k \times 1 \times \cdots \times 1 = k.$$

And the right-hand side is k . Since they are equal, the proposition holds for $\ell = 1$.

Inductive Step: Assume, for some $\ell - 1 \geq 1 \in [m - 1]$, that the proposition is true. That is, we assume the inductive hypothesis:

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell-1}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} = k$$

We now need to prove that the proposition is true for ℓ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} = k$$

Consider the left-hand side for ℓ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \\
&= \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell-1}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=t_{\ell-1}+}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}, i \notin \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} \\
&= \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell-1}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} \cdot \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=t_{\ell-1}+}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}, i \notin \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} \\
&= \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell-1}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} \cdot 1 \\
&= \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell-1}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell-1)}} m_i} = k.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the desired result for ℓ .

Conclusion: Since the base case is true and the inductive step has been established, by the principle of mathematical induction, the proposition $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} = k$ holds for all $\ell \in [m]$. \square

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic perfectness). *Our scheme is asymptotically perfect.*

Proof. For any $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B} \notin \Gamma$, by Lemmas 2 we get there exist $\gamma_q, q \in [2^m]$ elements in \mathcal{S} with the property that each of them is (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) of exactly Y_q possible candidates. It holds that the conditional probability

$$\Pr(\mathbf{S} = s | \mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) = \frac{Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|}.$$

for exactly γ_q values $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) &= H(\mathbf{S}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) \\
&= \log_2 m_0 - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Pr(\mathbf{S} = s | \mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) \log_2 \frac{1}{\Pr(\mathbf{S} = s | \mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}})} \\
&= \log_2 m_0 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Pr(\mathbf{S} = s | \mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) \log_2 \Pr(\mathbf{S} = s | \mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{V}'_{\mathcal{B}}) \\
&= \log_2 m_0 + \gamma_1 \frac{Y_1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_1}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \gamma_2 \frac{Y_2}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_2}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \cdots + \gamma_{2^m} \frac{Y_{2^m}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_{2^m}}{|\mathcal{G}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

We are considering the worst-case scenario, the other scenarios are similar.

$$|\mathcal{B} \cap (\cup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| = |\mathcal{B}^{\ell}| = t_{\ell} - 1 \text{ for all } \ell \in [m].$$

Form Lemmas 5, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large m_0 , we can know that

$$\left| \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} - k \right| < \epsilon.$$

It is mean that for all $\ell \in [m]$, any $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large m_0 ,

$$k - \epsilon < \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} < k + \epsilon.$$

For $\ell \in [m]$, if $k - \epsilon < \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} < k$, we obtain that all $\ell \in [m]$, $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right] =$

$k - 1$. Similarly, For $\ell \in [m]$, if $k < \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} < k + \epsilon$, we obtain that all $\ell \in [m]$,

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right] = k.$$

In summary, for the unauthorized set \mathcal{B} , the limit $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_{\ell}} m_i}{m_0 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{B}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right]$ at each level ℓ is a constant. This means that for unauthorized sets, at each level ℓ can be treated as a single-layer Asmuth-Bloom scheme. According to Lemma 4, for all secret $s \in \mathcal{S}$, its candidate values tends to a fixed constant. Therefore, in the hierarchical scheme, the candidate values for all secrets also tends to a fixed constant. As m_0 approaches infinity,

for all secret $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the number of possible candidates for (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) approaches Y_q , $q \in [2^m]$. In other words, we can obtain

$$\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_0 Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} = 1, \quad \lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_{q'} Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} = 0, \quad q' \neq q \in [2^m].$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{V}'_B) &= H(\mathbf{S}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_B) \\ &= \log_2 m_0 + \gamma_1 \frac{Y_1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_1}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \gamma_2 \frac{Y_2}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_2}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \dots + \gamma_{2^m} \frac{Y_{2^m}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_{2^m}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \\ &= \log_2 m_0 + \gamma_q \frac{Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \sum_{q' \neq q, q'=1}^{2^m} \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \\ &= \log_2 m_0 + \sum_{q'=1}^{2^m} \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \sum_{q' \neq q, q'=1}^{2^m} (\gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} - \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \log_2 \frac{Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|}) \\ &= \log_2 m_0 + \log_2 \frac{Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \sum_{q' \neq q, q'=1}^{2^m} \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} (\log_2 (\frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} \times \frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{Y_q})) \\ &= \log_2 \frac{m_0 Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \sum_{q' \neq q, q'=1}^{2^m} \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} (\log_2 (\frac{Y_{q'}}{Y_q})). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will prove that $\frac{Y_{q'}}{Y_q}$ is a bounded quantity. First, we introduce two notations x and x' to represent the number of 0 components in Y_q and $Y_{q'}$, respectively. This means

that Y_q is the product of x terms of $\left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right]$ and $m - x$ terms of $\left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right] + 1$ (with ℓ

only serving as a symbol here). Similarly, $Y_{q'}$ is the product of x' terms of $\left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right]$ and

$m - x'$ terms of $\left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right] + 1$. Considering the extreme case, we take $\lim_{m_0 \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{(\ell)}} m_i} \right] = k$,

thus $\Delta(\mathbf{V}'_B)$ is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{V}'_B) &= H(\mathbf{S}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_B) \\ &= \log_2 \frac{m_0 Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} + \sum_{q' \neq q, q'=1}^{2^m} \gamma_{q'} \frac{Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} (\log_2 (\frac{k^{x'} \cdot (k+1)^{m-x'}}{k^x \cdot (k+1)^{m-x}})). \end{aligned}$$

In summary, as m_0 approaches infinity, $\frac{m_0 Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|} = 1$, $\frac{\gamma_{q'} Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|} = 0$, $q' \neq q \in [2^m]$. Therefore, $\log_2 \frac{m_0 Y_q}{|\mathcal{G}|}$ approaches 0. Furthermore, the term $\log_2 \left(\frac{k^{x'} \cdot (k+1)^{m-x'}}{k^x \cdot (k+1)^{m-x}} \right)$ is bounded. Its limit therefore does not affect the outcome of $\Delta(\mathbf{V}'_B)$. However, $\frac{\gamma_{q'} Y_{q'}}{|\mathcal{G}|}$ tends to 0, $q' \neq q \in [2^m]$. Consequently, as m_0 approaches infinity, $\Delta(\mathbf{V}'_B)$ converges to 0.

Moreover, the secret in our scheme is randomly and uniformly, which means that $H(\mathbf{S}) = \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| = \log_2 m_0$. According to Lemma 3, for all $\epsilon_1 > 0$, there is a positive integer σ_1 such that for all $|\mathcal{S}| = m_0 > \sigma_1$, it holds that

$$0 < H(\mathbf{S}) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}_B) = H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}'_B) - H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{V}_B) < \epsilon_1.$$

As a result, our scheme is asymptotically perfect by Definition 4. \square

Theorem 3. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of n participants, and it is partitioned into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. For a threshold sequence t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m such that $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m \leq n$ and $t_\ell \leq |\mathcal{P}_\ell|$ for $\ell \in [m]$, our scheme is a secure and asymptotically perfect DHSS scheme. Furthermore, our scheme is an asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme if it is based on 1-compact sequences of co-primes.*

Proof. According to Definition 6, Theorem 4 and Theorem 2, we get that our scheme is a secure and asymptotically perfect DHSS scheme. Moreover, it is known that

$$s_i = \begin{cases} c_i, & \text{if } i \in [N_{m-1}], \\ y_m \pmod{m_i}, & \text{if } i \in [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m], \end{cases}$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}, i \in [N_{m-1}]$, $y_m = s + \alpha_m m_0$, and $\alpha_m \in \mathbb{Z}$. When scheme is based on 1-compact sequences of co-primes. We can get $m_0 < m_i < m_0 + m_0^\theta$, where $\theta \in (0, 1), i \in [n]$. We know the secret space is $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{Z}_{m_0}$ and the maximum share is \mathbb{Z}_{m_n} , which implies that the information rate is $\rho = \frac{\log_2 m_0}{\log_2 m_0 + m_0^\theta}$. Since $\theta \in (0, 1)$, m_0 is sufficiently large and that mean ρ approaching 1. According to Definition 4, our scheme is an asymptotically ideal DHSS scheme. \square

4 A novel asymptotically ideal CHSS scheme

In this section, we construct a hierarchical secret sharing scheme for conjunctive access structures. The construction is the same with DHSS scheme in subsection 3.1. Our scheme is given in subsection 4.1, and we analyze its security in subsection 4.2.

4.1 Our scheme 2

Let \mathcal{P} be a set of n participants, and it is divided into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. Let $n_\ell = |\mathcal{P}_\ell|$ and $N_\ell = \sum_{w=1}^\ell n_w$ for $\ell \in [m]$. For $\ell \in [m]$, let t_ℓ be the threshold of the subset $\bigcup_{w=1}^\ell \mathcal{P}_w$. The threshold sequence satisfy $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m$ and $t_\ell \leq N_\ell$. But the conjunctive access structures is $\Gamma = \{A \subseteq P : \forall \ell \in [m] \text{ such that } |A \cap$

$(\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w) \geq t_\ell$. Our scheme consists of two phases: the share generation phase and the secret reconstruction phase..

Share Generation Phase.

- The dealer first generates a publicly co-prime sequence, $L = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n\}$. The dealer assign each prime m_i to a participant i , $i \in [n]$. Let $L_\ell = \{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{N_\ell}\}$, $\ell \in [m]$ denotes the sub-sequence of L such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(i) m_0 is a big prime and $\gcd(m_w, m_j) = 1$, $0 \leq w < j \leq n$.

(ii) $m_0 < m_1 < \dots < m_{N_\ell}$, $\ell \in [m]$.

(iii) $km_0 < m_i < km_0 + m_0^\theta$, where $k \geq 1$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ are real numbers, $i \in [N_\ell]$ and $\ell \in [m]$.

- For any given secret $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_0}$, the dealer randomly selects $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{m-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_0}$. And the dealer computes $\delta_m = s - \delta_1 - \delta_2 - \dots - \delta_{m-1} \pmod{m_0}$. The dealer selects integers α_ℓ , $\ell \in [m]$ such that

$$0 \leq y_\ell = \delta_\ell + \alpha_\ell m_0 < m_1 m_2 \dots m_{t_\ell}$$

For $i \in [N_{\ell-1}]$, random integers $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ is selected by the dealer. The dealer sends each share s_i to the i -th participant, where

$$s_i = \begin{cases} c_i, & \text{if } i \in [N_{\ell-1}], \\ y_m \pmod{m_i}, & \text{if } i \in [N_{\ell-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

- The dealer selects m publicly known distinct one-way functions $h_1(\cdot), h_2(\cdot), \dots, h_m(\cdot)$. These functions $h_m(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ for $i \in [n], \ell \in [m]$. For any $i \in [N_{m-1}]$, there is an integer $\ell_1 \in [N_{m-1}]$ such that $i \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell_1}$. For all $\ell \in [\ell_1, m]$, the dealer computes and publishes

$$w_i^{(\ell)} = (y_\ell - h_\ell(s_i, \ell)) \pmod{m_i}.$$

Secret Reconstruction Phase. For any $\mathcal{A} \in \Gamma$ participants, let $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)$. Each $\ell \in [m]$ compute

$$y_\ell = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}},$$

where $M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i$, $M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} / m_i$, $\lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \equiv M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}^{-1} \pmod{m_i}$, and

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}, & \text{if } \ell \in [m-1], i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \subseteq [N_\ell], \\ h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

For all $\ell \in [m]$, they can get $\delta_\ell = y_\ell \pmod{m_0}$ and reconstruct the secret $s = \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \dots + \delta_m \pmod{m_0}$

4.2 Security analysis of our scheme

We will prove the correctness, asymptotic perfectness and asymptotic ideal of our scheme in this subsection.

Theorem 4 (Correctness). *Any authorized subset*

$$\mathcal{A} \in \Gamma = \{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} : \forall \ell \in [m] \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)| \geq t_\ell\}.$$

can reconstruct the secret.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}|}\}$ be an authorized subset such that $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\bigcup_{w=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{P}_w)$, $|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}| \geq t_\ell$ for all $\ell \in [m]$. We will prove that the all participants in $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$ can reconstruct the secret.

For $\ell \in [m-1]$, $i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}]$, each participant needs to compute the required values using the public one-way function $h_\ell(\cdot)$, the public values m_i , $w_i^{(\ell)} = (y_\ell - h_\ell(s_i, \ell)) \pmod{m_i}$. Namely, participants of $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$ compute

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = h_\ell(s_i, \ell) + w_i^{(\ell)}$$

For $\ell = m$, participants of $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}$ compute

$$s_i^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} h_m(s_i, m) + w_i^{(m)}, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1}], \\ s_i, & \text{if } \ell = m, i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_{m-1} + 1, N_m]. \end{cases}$$

for each $\ell \in [m]$, $i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \cap [N_\ell]$, they can get the system of congruences

$$\begin{cases} y_\ell \equiv s_{i_1}^{(\ell)} \pmod{m_{i_1}}, \\ y_\ell \equiv s_{i_2}^{(\ell)} \pmod{m_{i_2}}, \\ \vdots \\ y_\ell \equiv s_{i_{|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}|}}^{(\ell)} \pmod{m_{i_{|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}|}}}. \end{cases}$$

Based on the CRT for integer ring in Lemma 1, for each $\ell \in [m]$ holds that

$$y_\ell \equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}},$$

where $M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i$, $M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} = M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}/m_i$ and $\lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \equiv M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}^{-1}(x) \pmod{m_i}$. Since y_ℓ satisfies

$$y_\ell < \prod_{i=1}^{t_\ell} m_i \leq \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} m_i,$$

where $|\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}| \geq t_\ell$. From the CRT for integer ring in Lemma 1, it holds that

$$y_\ell = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} M_{i, \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}} s_i^{(\ell)} \pmod{M_{\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)}}},$$

and $\delta_\ell = y_\ell \pmod{m_0}$. Finally, the secret $s = (\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \dots + \delta_m) \pmod{m_0}$ □

As for the *asymptotic perfectness* of our scheme, a similar proof method has been mentioned in Subsection 3.2. Therefore, we will no longer describe it here. The proof is referred to the appendix.

Theorem 5. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of n participants, and it is partitioned into m disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. For a threshold sequence t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m such that $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m \leq n$ and $t_\ell \leq |\mathcal{P}_\ell|$ for $\ell \in [m]$, our scheme is a secure and asymptotically perfect CHSS scheme if and only if it is based on 1-compact sequences of co-primes.*

5 Conclusion

In this work, we construct asymptotically ideal DHSS and CHSS schemes based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem over integer rings. Compared to prior CRT-based constructions, our scheme achieves security, an information rate asymptotically approaching 1, and computational efficiency.

References

- [1] A. Shamir, How to share a secret, Communications of the ACM, vol.22, no.11, pp.612-613, 1979.
- [2] G. R. Blakley, Safeguarding cryptographic keys, in: 1979 International Workshop on Managing Requirements Knowledge, MARK, New York, NY, USA, pp. 313-318. IEEE, 1979.
- [3] G. J. Simmons, How to (really) share a secret, in: Advances in Cryptology-Crypto'88, Santa Barbara, California, USA. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol.403, pp.390-448. Springer, 1988.

- [4] T. Tassa, Hierarchical threshold secret sharing, *Journal of Cryptology*, vol.20, no.2, pp.237-264, 2007.
- [5] Q. Chen, C. Tang, and Z. Lin, Efficient explicit constructions of multipartite secret sharing schemes, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol.68, no.1, pp.601-631, 2022.
- [6] J. Yuan, J. Yang, C. Wang, X. Jia, F. Fu, G. Xu, A new efficient hierarchical multi-secret sharing scheme based on linear homogeneous recurrence relations, *Information Sciences*, vol. 592, pp.36-49,2022.
- [7] L. Harn, and F. MIAO, Multilevel threshold secret sharing based on the Chinese remainder theorem, *Information Processing Letters*, vol.114, no.9, 2014. 504-509.
- [8] O. Ersoy, K. Kaya, and K. Kaskaloglu, Multilevel Threshold Secret and Function Sharing based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem, arXiv: 1605.07988, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.07988>.
- [9] F. L. Tiplea, and C. C. Dragan, Asymptotically ideal Chinese remainder theorem-based secret sharing schemes for multilevel and compartmented access structures, *IET Information Security*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 282-296, 2021.
- [10] J. Yang, S.-T. Xia, X. Wang, J. Yuan, and F.-W. Fu, A perfect ideal hierarchical secret sharing scheme based on the CRT for Polynomial Rings, in: 2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Athens, Greece, pp.321-326. IEEE, 2024.
- [11] H. Cohen, *A Course in Computational Algebraic Number Theory*, 4thed., Grad. Texts Math, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [12] Y. Ning, F. Miao, W. Huang, K. Meng, Y. Xiong, and X. Wang, Constructing ideal secret sharing schemes based on Chinese Remainder Theorem, in: *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2018*, Brisbane, QLD, Australia. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11274, pp. 310-331. Springer, 2018.
- [13] M. Quisquater, B. Preneel, and J. Vandewalle, On the security of the threshold scheme based on the Chinese remainder theorem, in: *Public Key Cryptography, PKC 2002*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 2274, pp.199-210. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002.
- [14] E. F. Brickell, Some ideal secret sharing schemes, in: *Advances in Cryptology-Eurocrypt'89*, Houthalen, Belgium. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol.434, pp.468-475. Springer, 1989.

- [15] C. Asmuth and J. Bloom, A modular approach to key safeguarding, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 208-210, 1983.
- [16] S. Mo, Ideal hierarchical secret sharing and lattice path matroids, *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol.91, no.4, pp. 1335-1349, 2023.