

In-EVM Mina State Verification Proof System Description

Cherniaeva Alisa

a.cherniaeva@nil.foundation

=nil; Crypto3 (<https://crypto3.nil.foundation>)

Shirobokov Ilia

i.shirobokov@nil.foundation

=nil; Crypto3 (<https://crypto3.nil.foundation>)

November 14, 2021

1 Introduction

WIP

To prove Mina blockchain's state on the Ethereum Virtual Machine, we use Redshift SNARK[1]. RedShift is a transparent SNARK that uses PLONK[2] proof system but replaces the commitment scheme. The authors utilize FRI[3] protocol to obtain transparency for the PLONK system.

However, FRI cannot be straightforwardly used with the PLONK system. To achieve the required security level without huge overheads, the authors introduce *list polynomial commitment* scheme as a part of the protocol. For more details, we refer the reader to [1].

The original RedShift protocol utilizes the classic PLONK[2] system. To provide better performance, we generalize the original protocol for use with PLONK with custom gates [4], [5] and lookup arguments [6], [7].

2 RedShift Protocol

WIP

Notations:

N_{wires}	Number of wires ('advice columns')
N_{perm}	Number of wires that are included in the permutation argument
N_{sel}	Number of selectors used in the circuit
N_{const}	Number of constant columns
\mathbf{f}_i	Witness polynomials, $0 \leq i < N_{\text{wires}}$
\mathbf{f}_{c_i}	Constant-related polynomials, $0 \leq i < N_{\text{const}}$
\mathbf{gate}_i	Gate polynomials, $0 \leq i < N_{\text{sel}}$
$\sigma(\text{col} : i, \text{row} : j) = (\text{col} : i', \text{row} : j')$	Permutation over the table

For details on polynomial commitment scheme and polynomial evaluation scheme, we refer the reader to [1].

Preprocessing:

-
1. $\mathcal{L}' = (\mathbf{q}_0, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{N_{\text{sel}}})$
 2. Let ω be a 2^k root of unity
 3. Let δ be a T root of unity, where $T \cdot 2^S + 1 = p$ with T odd and $k \leq S$
 4. Compute N_{perm} permutation polynomials $S_{\sigma_i}(X)$ such that $S_{\sigma_i}(\omega^j) = \delta^{i'} \cdot \omega^{j'}$
 5. Compute N_{perm} identity permutation polynomials: $S_{id_i}(X)$ such that $S_{id_i}(\omega^j) = \delta^i \cdot \omega^j$
 6. Let $H = \{\omega^0, \dots, \omega^n\}$ be a cyclic subgroup of \mathbb{F}^*
 7. Let $Z(X) = \prod a \in H^*(X - a)$
-

2.1 Prover View

1. Choose masking polynomials:

$$h_i(X) \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_{<k}[X] \text{ for } 0 \leq i < N_{\text{wires}}$$

Remark: For details on choice of k , we refer the reader to [1].

2. Define new witness polynomials:

$$f_i(X) = \mathbf{f}_i(X) + h_i(X)Z(X) \text{ for } 0 \leq i < N_{\text{wires}}$$

3. Add commitments to f_i to transcript
4. Get $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{F}$ from $\text{hash}(\text{transcript})$
5. For $0 \leq i < N_{\text{perm}}$

$$\begin{aligned} p_i &= f_i + \beta \cdot S_{id_i} + \gamma \\ q_i &= f_i + \beta \cdot S_{\sigma_i} + \gamma \end{aligned}$$

6. Define:

$$\begin{aligned} p'(X) &= \prod_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{perm}}} p_i(X) \in \mathbb{F}_{<N_{\text{perm}} \cdot n}[X] \\ q'(X) &= \prod_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{perm}}} q_i(X) \in \mathbb{F}_{<N_{\text{perm}} \cdot n}[X] \end{aligned}$$

7. Compute $P(X), Q(X) \in \mathbb{F}_{<n+1}[X]$, such that:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\omega) &= Q(\omega) = 1 \\ P(\omega^i) &= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} p'(\omega^j) \text{ for } i \in 2, \dots, n+1 \\ Q(\omega^i) &= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} q'(\omega^j) \text{ for } i \in 2, \dots, n+1 \end{aligned}$$

8. Compute commitments to P, Q and add them to transcript.
9. Get $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_5 \in \mathbb{F}$ from $\text{hash}(\text{transcript})$
10. Define polynomials $(F_0, \dots, F_4 - \text{copy-satisfiability})$:

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(X) &= L_1(X)(P(X) - 1) \\ F_1(X) &= L_1(X)(Q(X) - 1) \\ F_2(X) &= P(X)p'(X) - P(X\omega) \\ F_3(X) &= Q(X)q'(X) - Q(X\omega) \\ F_4(X) &= L_n(X)(P(X\omega) - Q(X\omega)) \\ F_5(X) &= \sum_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{sel}}} (\mathbf{q}_i(X) \cdot \text{gate}_i(X)) + \sum_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{const}}} (\mathbf{f}_{c_i}(X)) + PI(X) \end{aligned}$$

11. Compute:

$$F(X) = \sum_{i=0}^5 \alpha_i F_i(X)$$

$$T(X) = \frac{F(X)}{Z(X)}$$

12. Split $T(X)$ into separate polynomials $T_0(X), \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}}}(X)$

13. Add commitments to $T_0(X), \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}}}(X)$ to transcript.

14. Get $y \in \mathbb{F}/H$ from $\text{hash}(\text{transcript})$

15. Run evaluation scheme with the committed polynomials and y .

Remark: Depending on the circuit, evaluation can be done also on $y\omega, y\omega^{-1}$.

16. The proof is π_{comm} and π_{eval} , where:

- $\pi_{\text{comm}} = \{f_{0,\text{comm}}, \dots, f_{N_{\text{wires}},\text{comm}}, P_{\text{comm}}, Q_{\text{comm}}, T_{0,\text{comm}}, \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}},\text{comm}}\}$
- π_{eval} is evaluation proofs for $f_0(y), \dots, f_{N_{\text{wires}}}(y), P(y), P(y\omega), Q(y), Q(y\omega), T_0(y), \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}}}(y)$

2.2 Verifier View

1. Let $f_{0,\text{comm}}, \dots, f_{N_{\text{wires}},\text{comm}}$ be commitments to $f_0(X), \dots, f_{N_{\text{wires}}}(X)$

2. $\text{transcript} = \text{setup_values} || f_{0,\text{comm}} || \dots || f_{N_{\text{wires}},\text{comm}}$

3. $\beta, \gamma = \text{hash}(\text{transcript})$

4. Let $P_{\text{comm}}, Q_{\text{comm}}$ be commitments to $P(X), Q(X)$

5. $\text{transcript} = \text{transcript} || P_{\text{comm}} || Q_{\text{comm}}$

6. $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_5 = \text{hash}(\text{transcript})$

7. Let $T_{0,\text{comm}}, \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}},\text{comm}}$ be commitments to $T_0(X), \dots, T_{N_{\text{perm}}}(X)$

8. $\text{transcript} = \text{transcript} || T_{0,\text{comm}} || \dots || T_{N_{\text{perm}},\text{comm}}$

9. $y = \text{hash}_{\mathbb{F}/H}(\text{transcript})$

10. Run evaluation scheme verification with the committed polynomials and y to check values $f_i(y), P(y), P(y\omega), Q(y), Q(y\omega), T_j(y)$.

Remark: Depending on the circuit, evaluation can be done also on $f_i(y\omega), f_i(y\omega^{-1})$ for some i .

11. Calculate:

$$F_0(y) = L_1(y)(P(y) - 1)$$

$$F_1(y) = L_1(y)(Q(y) - 1)$$

$$p'(y) = \prod p_i(y) = \prod f_i(y) + \beta \cdot S_{id_i}(y) + \gamma$$

$$F_2(y) = P(y)p'(y) - P(y\omega)$$

$$q'(y) = \prod q_i(y) = \prod f_i(y) + \beta \cdot S_{\sigma_i}(y) + \gamma$$

$$F_3(y) = Q(y)q'(y) - Q(y\omega)$$

$$F_4(y) = L_n(y)(P(y\omega) - Q(y\omega))$$

$$F_5(y) = \sum_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{sel}}} (\mathbf{q}_i(y) \cdot \text{gate}_i(y)) + \sum_{0 \leq i < N_{\text{const}}} (\mathbf{f}_{c_i}(y)) + PI(y)$$

$$T(y) = \sum_{0 \leq j < N_{\text{perm}}+1} y^{n \cdot j} T_j(y)$$

12. Check the identity:

$$\sum_{i=0}^5 \alpha_i F_i(y) = Z(y)T(y)$$

3 Optimizations

WIP

3.1 Batched FRI

Instead of check each commitment individually, we can aggregate them for FRI. For polynomials f_0, \dots, f_k :

1. Get θ from transcript
2. $f = f_0 \cdot \theta^{k-1} + \dots + f_k$
3. Run FRI over f , using oracles to f_0, \dots, f_k

Thus, we can run only one FRI instance for all committed polynomials.
See [1] for details.

3.2 Hash By Column

Instead of committing each of the polynomials, we can use the same Merkle tree for several polynomials. It decreases the number of Merkle tree paths that need to be provided by the prover.

See [8], [1] for details.

3.3 Hash By Subset

On the each $i + 1$ FRI round, the prover should send all elements from a coset $H \in D^{(i)}$. Each Merkle leaf is able to contain the whole coset instead of separate values.

See [8] for details. Similar approach is described in [1]. However, the authors of [1] use more values per leaf, that leads to better performance.

References

1. Kattis A., Panarin K., Vlasov A. RedShift: Transparent SNARKs from List Polynomial Commitment IOPs. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2019/1400. 2019. <https://ia.cr/2019/1400>.
2. Gabizon A., Williamson Z. J., Ciobotaru O. PLONK: Permutations over Lagrange-bases for Oecumenical Noninteractive arguments of Knowledge. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2019/953. 2019. <https://ia.cr/2019/953>.
3. Fast Reed-Solomon interactive oracle proofs of proximity / E. Ben-Sasson, I. Bentov, Y. Horesh et al. // 45th international colloquium on automata, languages, and programming (icalp 2018) / Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. 2018.
4. Gabizon A., Williamson Z. J. Proposal: The Turbo-PLONK program syntax for specifying SNARK programs. https://docs.zkproof.org/pages/standards/accepted-workshop3/proposal-turbo_plonk.pdf.
5. PLONKish Arithmetization - The halo2 book. <https://zcash.github.io/halo2/concepts/arithmetization.html>.
6. Gabizon A., Williamson Z. J. plookup: A simplified polynomial protocol for lookup tables. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2020/315. 2020. <https://ia.cr/2020/315>.
7. Lookup argument - The halo2 book. <https://zcash.github.io/halo2/design/proving-system/lookup.html>.
8. Chiesa A., Ojha D., Spooner N. Fractal: Post-Quantum and Transparent Recursive Proofs from Holography. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2019/1076. 2019. <https://ia.cr/2019/1076>.