

# Bootstrapping for `HElib`

Shai Halevi (IBM)

Victor Shoup\*(NYU)

January 30, 2015

## Abstract

Gentry’s bootstrapping technique is still the only known method of obtaining fully homomorphic encryption where the system’s parameters do not depend on the complexity of the evaluated functions. Bootstrapping involves a *recryption* procedure where the scheme’s decryption algorithm is evaluated homomorphically. So far, there have been precious few implementations of recryption, and fewer still that can handle “packed ciphertexts” that encrypt vectors of elements.

In the current work, we report on an implementation of recryption of fully-packed ciphertexts using the `HElib` library for somewhat-homomorphic encryption. This implementation required extending the recryption algorithms from the literature, as well as many aspects of the `HElib` library. Our implementation supports bootstrapping of packed ciphertexts over many extension fields/rings. One example that we tested involves ciphertexts that encrypt vectors of 1024 elements from  $\text{GF}(2^{16})$ . In that setting, the recryption procedure takes under 5.5 minutes (at security-level  $\approx 76$ ) on a single core, and allows a depth-9 computation before the next recryption is needed.

**Keywords:** Bootstrapping, Homomorphic Encryption, Implementation

---

\*Work partially done in IBM Research.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Algorithmic Aspects . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Notations and Background</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	The BGV Cryptosystem . . . . .	3
2.2	Encoding Vectors in Plaintext Slots . . . . .	3
2.3	Hypercube structure and one-dimensional rotations . . . . .	4
2.4	Frobenius and linearized polynomials . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Overview of the Recryption Procedure</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	The GHS Recryption Procedure . . . . .	5
3.2	Our Recryption Procedure . . . . .	7
<b>4</b>	<b>The Linear Transformations</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Algebraic Background . . . . .	8
4.2	The Evaluation Map . . . . .	9
4.2.1	The Eval Transformation . . . . .	10
4.2.2	The Transformation $\text{Eval}^{-1}$ . . . . .	12
4.3	Unpacking and Repacking the Slots . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Recryption with Plaintext Space Modulo <math>p &gt; 2</math></b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	Simpler Decryption Formula . . . . .	14
5.2	Making an Integer Divisible By $p^{e'}$ . . . . .	14
5.3	Digit-Extraction for Plaintext Space Modulo $p^r$ . . . . .	15
5.3.1	An optimization for $p = 2, r \geq 2$ . . . . .	17
5.4	Putting Everything Together . . . . .	18
<b>6</b>	<b>Implementation and Performance</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Future work</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Parameters for Digit Extraction</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Why We Didn't Use Ring Switching</b>	<b>25</b>

# 1 Introduction

Homomorphic Encryption (HE) [26, 11] enables computation of arbitrary functions on encrypted data without knowing the secret key. All current HE schemes follow Gentry’s outline from [11], where fresh ciphertexts are “noisy” to ensure security and this noise grows with every operation until it overwhelms the signal and causes decryption errors. This yields a “somewhat homomorphic” scheme (SWHE) that can only evaluate low-depth circuits, which can then be converted to a “fully homomorphic” scheme (FHE) using bootstrapping. Gentry described a *recryption* operation, where the decryption procedure of the scheme is run homomorphically, using an encryption of the secret key that can be found in the public key, resulting in a new ciphertext that encrypts the same plaintext but has smaller noise.

The last few years saw a large body of work improving many aspects of homomorphic encryption in general (e.g., [4, 14, 7, 21, 3, 17, 5]) and recryption in particular [16, 1, 2, 24, 10]. However, so far, only a few implementations of SWHE have been reported, and even fewer support recryption. Prior to the current work, we are aware of only three reported implementations of recryption: the implementation by Gentry and Halevi [12] of Gentry’s original cryptosystem [11], the implementation of Coron, Lepoint, and Tibouchi [7, 6, 8] of van Dijk, Gentry, Halevi and Vaikuntanathan’s (DGHV) scheme over the integers [9], and the implementation by Rohloff and Cousins [27] of the NTRU-based cryptosystem [20, 21].

In this paper we report on our new implementation of recryption for the cryptosystem of Brakerski, Gentry and Vaikuntanathan (BGV) [4]. We implemented recryption on top of the open-source library `HElib` [19, 18], which implements the ring-LWE variant of BGV. Our implementation includes both new algorithmic designs as well as re-engineering of some aspects of `HElib`. As noted in [18], the choice of homomorphic primitives in `HElib` was guided to a large extent by the desire to support recryption, but nonetheless in the course of our implementation we had to extend the implementation of some of these primitives (e.g., matrix-vector multiplication), and also implement a few new ones (e.g., polynomial evaluation).

The `HElib` library is “focused on effective use of the Smart-Vercauteren ciphertext packing techniques [29] and the Gentry-Halevi-Smart optimizations [14],” so in particular we implemented recryption for “fully-packed” ciphertexts. Specifically, our implementation supports recryption of ciphertexts that encrypt vectors of elements from extension fields (or rings). Importantly, our recryption procedure itself has rather low depth (usually 10-13 levels), so as to allow significant processing between recryptions while keeping the lattice dimension reasonable to maintain efficiency.

Our results are described in Section 6; some example settings include: encrypting vectors of 1024 elements from  $\text{GF}(2^{16})$  with a security level of 76 bits, where recryption takes 320 seconds and depth 12 (and allows additional computations of depth 9 between recryptions); and encrypting vectors of 960 elements from  $\text{GF}(2^{24})$  with a security level of 123 bits, where recryption takes 7–8 minutes and depth 13 (and allows additional computations of depth 10 between recryptions).<sup>1</sup>

Compared to the previous recrypt implementations, ours offers several advantages in both flexibility and speed. While the Gentry-Halevi and Rohloff-Cousins implementations only encrypt *one bit* per ciphertext, and the Coron-Lepoint-Tibouchi implementation allows *many bits* to be packed into a ciphertext, our implementation supports packed ciphertexts that encrypt vectors from the more general extension fields (and rings) already supported by `HElib`. Some examples that we tested include vectors over the fields  $\text{GF}(2^{16})$ ,  $\text{GF}(2^{25})$ ,  $\text{GF}(2^{24})$ ,  $\text{GF}(2^{36})$ ,  $\text{GF}(17^{40})$ , and  $\text{GF}(127^{36})$ , as well as degree-21 and degree-30 extensions of the ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{256}$ .

In terms of speed, the Gentry-Halevi implementation reportedly took 1/2-hour on a single core to recrypt a single-bit ciphertext. The Rohloff-Cousins implementation reported recryption time of

---

<sup>1</sup>We used the latter setting with our re-implementation of homomorphic AES, see the long version of [15].

275 seconds on 20 cores for a single-bit ciphertext with 64-bit security. The Coron-Lepoint-Tibouchi implementation reports a decryption time of 172 seconds on 4 cores for a ciphertext with 513 one-bit slots at a security level of 72. For similar setting, we clocked a single-core decryption time of 320 seconds for a ciphertext with 1024 slots of elements of  $\text{GF}(2^{16})$  at a security level of 76. We note that the same parallelism that was used by Rohloff and Cousins could in principle be applied to our implementation too, but doing so involves several software-engineering challenges, and we have not yet attempted it.

**Concurrent work.** Concurrently with our work, Ducas and Micciancio described a new bootstrapping procedure [10]. This procedure is applied to Regev-like ciphertexts [25] that encrypt a single bit, using a secret key encrypted similarly to the new cryptosystem of Gentry et al. [17]. They reported on an implementation of their scheme, where they can perform a NAND operation followed by decryption in less than a second. Compared to our scheme, theirs has the advantage of a much faster wall-clock time for decryption, but they do not support batching or large plaintext spaces (hence our implementation has much better amortized per-bit timing). It is a very interesting open problem to combine their techniques with ours, achieving a “best of both worlds” implementation.

## 1.1 Algorithmic Aspects

Our decryption procedure follows the high-level structure introduced by Gentry et al. [16], and uses the tensor decomposition of Alperin-Sheriff and Peikert [1] for the linear transformations. However, those two works only dealt with characteristic-2 plaintext spaces so we had to extend some of their algorithmic components to deal with characteristics  $p > 2$  (see Section 5).

Also, to get an efficient implementation, we had to make the decomposition from [1] explicit, specialize it to cases that support very-small-depth circuits, and align the different representations to reduce the required data-movement and multiplication-by-constant operations. These aspects are described in Section 4. One significant difference between our implementation and the procedure of Alperin-Sheriff and Peikert [1] is that we *do not use* the ring-switching techniques of Gentry et al. [13] (see discussion in Appendix B).

**Organization.** We describe our notations and give some background information on the BGV cryptosystem and the `HElib` library in Section 2. In Section 3 we provide an overview of the high-level decryption procedure from [16] and our variant of it. We then describe in detail our implementation of the linear transformations in Section 4 and the non-linear parts in Section 5. In Section 5.4 we explain how all these parts are put together in our implementation, and in Section 6 we discuss our performance results. We conclude with directions for future work in Section 7. In Appendix A we describe our choice of parameters.

## 2 Notations and Background

For integer  $z$ , we denote by  $[z]_q$  the reduction of  $z$  modulo  $q$  into the interval  $[-q/2, q/2)$ , except that for  $q = 2$  we reduce to  $(-1, 1]$ . This notation extends to vectors and matrices coordinate-wise, and to elements of other algebraic groups/rings/fields by reducing their coefficients in some convenient basis.

For an integer  $z$  (positive or negative) we consider the base- $p$  representation of  $z$  and denote its digits by  $z\langle 0 \rangle_p, z\langle 1 \rangle_p, \dots$ . When  $p$  is clear from the context we omit the subscript and just write  $z\langle 0 \rangle, z\langle 1 \rangle, \dots$ . When  $p = 2$  we consider a 2’s-complement representation of signed integers (i.e., the top bit represent a large negative number). For an odd  $p$  we consider balanced mod- $p$  representation where all the digits are in  $[-\frac{p-1}{2}, \frac{p-1}{2}]$ .

For indexes  $0 \leq i \leq j$  we also denote by  $z\langle j, \dots, i \rangle_p$  the integer whose base- $p$  expansion is  $z\langle j \rangle \dots z\langle i \rangle$  (with  $z\langle i \rangle$  the least significant digit). Namely, for odd  $p$  we have  $z\langle j, \dots, i \rangle_p = \sum_{k=i}^j z\langle k \rangle p^{k-i}$ , and for  $p = 2$  we have  $z\langle j, \dots, i \rangle_2 = (\sum_{k=i}^{j-1} z\langle k \rangle 2^{k-i}) - z\langle j \rangle 2^{j-i}$ . The properties of these representations that we use in our procedures are the following:

- For any  $r \geq 1$  and any integer  $z$  we have  $z = z\langle r-1, \dots, 0 \rangle \pmod{p^r}$ .
- If the representation of  $z$  is  $d_{r-1}, \dots, d_0$  then the representation of  $z \cdot p^r$  is  $d_{r-1}, \dots, d_0, \overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^{r \text{ zeros}}$ .
- If  $p$  is odd and  $|z| < p^e/2$  then the digits in positions  $e$  and up in the representation of  $z$  are all zero.
- If  $p = 2$  and  $|z| < 2^{e-1}$ , then the bits in positions  $e-1$  and up in the representation of  $z$ , are either all zero if  $z \geq 0$  or all one if  $z < 0$ .

## 2.1 The BGV Cryptosystem

The BGV ring-LWE-based somewhat-homomorphic scheme [4] is defined over a ring  $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z}[X]/(\Phi_m(X))$ , where  $\Phi_m(X)$  is the  $m$ th cyclotomic polynomial. For an arbitrary integer modulus  $N$  (not necessarily prime) we denote the ring  $R_N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R/NR$ . We often identify elements in  $R$  (or  $R_N$ ) with their representation in some convenient basis, e.g., their coefficient vectors as polynomials. When dealing with  $R_N$ , we assume that the coefficients are in  $[-N/2, N/2)$  (except for  $R_2$  where the coefficients are in  $\{0, 1\}$ ). We discuss these representations in some more detail in Section 4.1. The norm of an element  $\|a\|$  is defined as its norm in some convenient basis.<sup>2</sup>

As implemented in **HElib**, the native plaintext space of the BGV cryptosystem is  $R_{p^r}$  for a prime power  $p^r$ . The scheme is parametrized by a sequence of decreasing moduli  $q_L \gg q_{L-1} \gg \dots \gg q_0$ , and an “ $i$ th level ciphertext” in the scheme is a vector  $\text{ct} \in (R_{q_i})^2$ . Secret keys are elements  $\mathfrak{s} \in R$  with “small” coefficients (chosen in  $\{0, \pm 1\}$  in **HElib**), and we view  $\mathfrak{s}$  as the second element of the 2-vector  $\text{sk} = (1, \mathfrak{s}) \in R^2$ . A level- $i$  ciphertext  $\text{ct} = (\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1)$  encrypts a plaintext element  $\mathbf{m} \in R_{p^r}$  with respect to  $\text{sk} = (1, \mathfrak{s})$  if we have  $[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct} \rangle]_{q_i} = [\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathfrak{s} \cdot \mathbf{c}_1]_{q_i} = \mathbf{m} + p^r \cdot \mathfrak{e}$  (in  $R$ ) for some “small” error term,  $p^r \cdot \|\mathfrak{e}\| \ll q_i$ .

The error term grows with homomorphic operations of the cryptosystem, and switching from  $q_{i+1}$  to  $q_i$  is used to decrease the error term roughly by the ratio  $q_{i+1}/q_i$ . Once we have a level-0 ciphertext  $\text{ct}$ , we can no longer use that technique to reduce the noise. To enable further computation, we need to use Gentry’s bootstrapping technique [11], whereby we “recrypt” the ciphertext  $\text{ct}$ , to obtain a new ciphertext  $\text{ct}^*$  that encrypts the same element of  $R_{p^r}$  with respect to some level  $i > 0$ .

In **HElib**, each  $q_i$  is a product of small (machine-word sized) primes. Elements of the ring  $R_{q_i}$  are typically represented in *DoubleCRT* format: as a vector of polynomials modulo each small prime  $t$ , each of which itself is represented by its evaluation at the primitive  $m$ th roots of unity in  $\mathbb{Z}_t$ . In DoubleCRT format, elements of  $R_{q_i}$  may be added and multiplied in linear time. Conversion between DoubleCRT representation and the more natural coefficient representation may be affected in quasi-linear time using the FFT.

## 2.2 Encoding Vectors in Plaintext Slots

As observed by Smart and Vercauteren [29], an element of the native plaintext space  $\alpha \in R_{p^r}$  can be viewed as encoding a vector of “plaintext slots” containing elements from some smaller ring extension of  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  via Chinese remaindering. In this way, a single arithmetic operation on  $\alpha$  corresponds to the same operation applied component-wise to all the slots.

<sup>2</sup>The difference between the norm in the different bases is not very important for the current work.

Specifically, suppose the factorization of  $\Phi_m(X)$  modulo  $p^r$  is  $\Phi_m(X) \equiv F_1(X) \cdots F_k(X) \pmod{p^r}$ , where each  $F_i$  has the same degree  $d$ , which is equal to the order of  $p$  modulo  $m$ . (This factorization can be obtained by factoring  $\Phi_m(X)$  modulo  $p$  and then Hensel lifting.) From the CRT for polynomials, we have the isomorphism

$$R_{p^r} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^k (\mathbb{Z}[X]/(p^r, F_i(X))).$$

Let us now define  $E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z}[X]/(p^r, F_1(X))$ , and let  $\zeta$  be the residue class of  $X$  in  $E$ , which is a principal  $m$ th root of unity, so that  $E = \mathbb{Z}/(p^r)[\zeta]$ . The rings  $\mathbb{Z}[X]/(p^r, F_i(X))$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  are all isomorphic to  $E$ , and their direct product is isomorphic to  $R_{p^r}$ , so we get an isomorphism between  $R_{p^r}$  and  $E^k$ . **HElib** makes extensive use of this isomorphism, representing it explicitly as follows. It maintains a set  $S \subset \mathbb{Z}$  that forms a complete system of representatives for the quotient group  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle$ , i.e., it contains exactly one element from every residue class. Then we use a ring isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} R_{p^r} &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{h \in S} E \\ \alpha &\mapsto \{\alpha(\zeta^h)\}_{h \in S}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, if  $\alpha$  is the residue class  $a(X) + (p^r, \Phi_m(X))$  for some  $a(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ , then  $\alpha(\zeta^h) = a(\zeta^h) \in E$ , which is independent of the representative  $a(X)$ .

This representation allows **HElib** to effectively pack  $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |S| = |\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle|$  elements of  $E$  into different “slots” of a single plaintext. Addition and multiplication of ciphertexts act on the slots of the corresponding plaintext in parallel.

### 2.3 Hypercube structure and one-dimensional rotations

Beyond addition and multiplications, we can also manipulate elements in  $R_{p^r}$  using a set of automorphisms on  $R_{p^r}$  of the form  $a(X) \mapsto a(X^j)$ , or in more detail

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_j : R_{p^r} &\rightarrow R_{p^r} \\ a(X) + (p^r, \Phi_m(X)) &\mapsto a(X^j) + (p^r, \Phi_m(X)). \end{aligned} \quad (j \in \mathbb{Z}_m^*)$$

We can homomorphically apply these automorphisms by applying them to the ciphertext elements and then performing “key switching” (see [4, 14]). As discussed in [14], these automorphisms induce a hypercube structure on the plaintext slots, where the hypercube structure depends on the structure of the group  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle$ . Specifically, **HElib** keeps a hypercube basis  $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathbb{Z}_m$  with orders  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , and then defines the set  $S$  of representatives for  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle$  (which is used for slot mapping Eqn. (1)) as

$$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{g_1^{e_1} \cdots g_n^{e_n} \bmod m : 0 \leq e_i < \ell_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}. \tag{2}$$

This basis defines an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube structure on the plaintext slots, where slots are indexed by tuples  $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$  with  $0 \leq e_i < \ell_i$ . If we fix  $e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}, e_{i+1}, \dots, e_n$ , and let  $e_i$  range over  $0, \dots, \ell_i - 1$ , we get a set of  $\ell_i$  slots, indexed by  $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$ , which we refer to as a *hypercolumn in dimension  $i$*  (and there are  $k/\ell_i$  such hypercolumns). Using automorphisms, we can efficiently perform rotations in any dimension; a rotation by  $v$  in dimension  $i$  maps a slot indexed by  $(e_1, \dots, e_i, \dots, e_n)$  to the slot indexed by  $(e_1, \dots, e_i + v \bmod \ell_i, \dots, e_n)$ . Below we denote this operation by  $\rho_i^v$ .

We can implement  $\rho_i^v$  by applying either one automorphism or two: if the order of  $g_i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$  is  $\ell_i$ , then we get by with just a single automorphism,  $\rho_i^v(\alpha) = \tau_{g_i^v}(\alpha)$ . If the order of  $g_i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$  is different from  $\ell_i$  then we need to implement this rotation using two shifts: specifically, we use a constant “0-1 mask value”  $\text{mask}$  that selects some slots and zeros-out the others, and use two automorphisms with exponents  $e = g_i^v \bmod m$  and  $e' = g_i^{v-\ell_i} \bmod m$ , setting

$$\rho_i^v(\alpha) = \tau_e(\text{mask} \cdot \alpha) + \tau_{e'}((1 - \text{mask}) \cdot \alpha).$$

In the first case (where one automorphism suffices) we call  $i$  a “good dimension”, and otherwise we call  $i$  a “bad dimension”.

## 2.4 Frobenius and linearized polynomials

We define  $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_p$ , which is the Frobenius map on  $R_{p^r}$ . It acts on each slot independently as the Frobenius map  $\sigma_E$  on  $E$ , which sends  $\zeta$  to  $\zeta^p$  and leaves elements of  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  fixed. (When  $r = 1$ ,  $\sigma$  is the same as the  $p$ th power map on  $E$ .) For any  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear transformation on  $E$ , denoted  $M$ , there exist unique constants  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{d-1} \in E$  such that  $M(\eta) = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \theta_f \sigma_E^f(\eta)$  for all  $\eta \in E$ . When  $r = 1$ , this follows from the general theory of linearized polynomials (see, e.g., Theorem 10.4.4 on p. 237 of [28]), and these constants are readily computable by solving a system of equations mod  $p$ ; when  $r > 1$ , we may Hensel-lift these mod- $p$  solutions to a solution mod  $p^r$ . In the special case where the image of  $M$  is the sub-ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  of  $E$ , the constants  $\theta_f$  are obtained as  $\theta_f = \sigma_E^f(\theta_0)$  for  $f = 1, \dots, d-1$ ; again, this is standard field theory if  $r = 1$ , and is easily established for  $r > 1$  as well.

Using linearized polynomials, we may effectively apply a fixed linear map to each slot of a plaintext element  $\alpha \in R_{p^r}$  (either the same or different maps in each slot) by computing  $\sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \kappa_f \sigma^f(\alpha)$ , where the  $\kappa_f$ ’s are  $R_{p^r}$ -constants obtained by embedding appropriate  $E$ -constants in the slots. Applying such linear  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear transformation(s) homomorphically on an encryption of  $\alpha$  takes  $d-1$  automorphisms and  $d$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, and can be done in depth of one constant-ciphertext multiplication (since automorphisms consume almost no depth).

## 3 Overview of the Recryption Procedure

Recall that the recryption procedure is given a BGV ciphertext  $\text{ct} = (\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1)$ , defined relative to secret-key  $\text{sk} = (1, \mathbf{s})$ , modulus  $q$ , and plaintext space  $p^r$ , namely, we have  $[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct} \rangle]_q \equiv \mathbf{m} \pmod{p^r}$  with  $\mathbf{m}$  being the plaintext. Also we have the guarantee that the noise in  $\text{ct}$  is still rather small, say  $\|[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct} \rangle]_q\| < q/100$ .

The goal of the recryption procedure is to produce another ciphertext  $\text{ct}^*$  that encrypts the same plaintext element  $\mathbf{m}$  relative to the same secret key, but relative to a much larger modulus  $Q \gg q$  and with a much smaller relative noise. That is, we still want to get  $[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}^* \rangle]_Q = \mathbf{m} \pmod{p^r}$ , but with  $\|[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}^* \rangle]_Q\| \ll Q$ .<sup>3</sup> Our implementation uses roughly the same high-level structure for the recryption procedure as in [16, 1], below we briefly recall the structure from [16] and then describe our variant of it.

### 3.1 The GHS Recryption Procedure

The recryption procedure from [16] (for plaintext space  $p = 2$ ) begins by using modulus-switching to compute another ciphertext that encrypts the same plaintext as  $\text{ct}$ , but relative to a specially chosen modulus  $\tilde{q} = 2^e + 1$  (for some integer  $e$ ).

<sup>3</sup>The relative noise after recryption is a design parameter. In our implementation we tried to get the noise below  $Q/2^{250}$ , to allow significant additional processing before another recryption is needed.

Denote the resulting ciphertext by  $\text{ct}'$ , the rest of the decryption procedure consists of homomorphic implementation of the decryption formula  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow [[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}' \rangle]_{\tilde{q}}]_2$ , applied to an encryption of  $\text{sk}$  that can be found in the public key. Note that in this formula we know  $\text{ct}' = (\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1)$  explicitly, and it is  $\text{sk}$  that we process homomorphically. It was shown in [16] that for the special modulus  $\tilde{q}$ , the decryption procedure can be evaluated (roughly) by computing  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow [\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}' \rangle]_{2^{e+1}}$  and then  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}\langle e \rangle \oplus \mathbf{u}\langle 0 \rangle$ .<sup>4</sup>

To enable decryption, the public key is augmented with an encryption of the secret key  $\mathbf{s}$ , relative to a (much) larger modulus  $Q \gg \tilde{q}$ , and also relative to a larger plaintext space  $2^{e+1}$ . Namely this is a ciphertext  $\tilde{\text{ct}}$  such that  $[\langle \text{sk}, \tilde{\text{ct}} \rangle]_Q = \mathbf{s} \pmod{2^{e+1}}$ . Recalling that all the coefficients in  $\text{ct}' = (\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1)$  are smaller than  $\tilde{q}/2 < 2^{e+1}/2$ , we consider  $\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1$  as plaintext elements modulo  $2^{e+1}$ , and compute homomorphically the inner-product  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow \mathbf{c}'_1 \cdot \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{c}'_0 \pmod{2^{e+1}}$  by setting

$$\tilde{\text{ct}}' \leftarrow \mathbf{c}'_1 \cdot \tilde{\text{ct}} + (\mathbf{c}'_0, 0).$$

This means that  $\tilde{\text{ct}}'$  encrypts the desired  $\mathbf{u}$ , and to complete the decryption procedure we just need to extract and XOR the top and bottom bits from all the coefficients in  $\mathbf{u}$ , thus getting an encryption of (the coefficients of) the plaintext  $\mathbf{m}$ . This calculation is the most expensive part of decryption, and it is done in three steps:

**Linear transformation.** First apply homomorphically a  $Z_{2^{e+1}}$ -linear transformation to  $\tilde{\text{ct}}'$ , converting it into ciphertexts that have the coefficients of  $\mathbf{u}$  in the plaintext slots.

**Bit extraction.** Next apply a homomorphic (non-linear) bit-extraction procedure, computing two ciphertexts that contain the top and bottom bits (respectively) of the integers stored in the slots. A side-effect of the bit-extraction computation is that the plaintext space is reduced from  $\text{mod-}2^{e+1}$  to  $\text{mod-}2$ , so adding the two ciphertexts we get a ciphertext whose slots contain the coefficients of  $\mathbf{m}$  relative to a  $\text{mod-}2$  plaintext space.

**Inverse linear transformation.** Finally apply homomorphically the inverse linear transformation (this time over  $Z_2$ ), obtaining a ciphertext  $\text{ct}^*$  that encrypts the plaintext element  $\mathbf{m}$ .

**An optimization.** The deepest part of decryption is bit-extraction, and its complexity — both time and depth — increases with the most-significant extracted bit (i.e., with  $e$ ). The parameter  $e$  can be made somewhat smaller by choosing a smaller  $\tilde{q} = 2^e + 1$ , but for various reasons  $\tilde{q}$  cannot be too small, so Gentry et al. described in [16] an optimization for reducing the top extracted bit without reducing  $\tilde{q}$ .

After modulus-switching to the ciphertext  $\text{ct}$ , we can add multiples of  $\tilde{q}$  to the coefficients of  $\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1$  to make them divisible by  $2^{e'}$  for some moderate-size  $e' < e$ . Let  $\text{ct}'' = (\mathbf{c}''_0, \mathbf{c}''_1)$  be the resulting ciphertext, clearly  $[\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}'' \rangle]_{\tilde{q}} = [\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}' \rangle]_{\tilde{q}}$  so  $\text{ct}''$  still encrypts the same plaintext  $\mathbf{m}$ . Moreover, as long as the coefficients of  $\text{ct}''$  are sufficiently smaller than  $\tilde{q}^2$ , we can still use the same simplified decryption formula  $\mathbf{u}' \leftarrow [\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}'' \rangle]_{2^{e+1}}$  and  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}'\langle e \rangle \oplus \mathbf{u}'\langle 0 \rangle$ .

However, since  $\text{ct}''$  is divisible by  $2^{e'}$  then so is  $\mathbf{u}'$ . For one thing this means that  $\mathbf{u}'\langle 0 \rangle = 0$  so the decryption procedure can be simplified to  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}'\langle e \rangle$ . But more importantly, we can divide  $\text{ct}''$  by  $2^{e'}$  and compute instead  $\mathbf{u}'' \leftarrow [\langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}''/2^{e'} \rangle]_{2^{e-e'+1}}$  and  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}''\langle e - e' \rangle$ . This means that the encryption of  $\mathbf{s}$  in the public key can be done relative to plaintext space  $2^{e-e'}$  and we only need to extract  $e - e'$  bits rather than  $e$ .

In this work we observe that we can do even slightly better by adding to  $\text{ct}'$  multiples of  $\tilde{q}$  and also multiples of 2 (or more generally multiples of  $\tilde{q}$  and  $p$  when decrypting a ciphertext with  $\text{mod-}p$

<sup>4</sup>This is a slight simplification, the actual formula for  $p = 2$  is  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}\langle e \rangle \oplus \mathbf{u}\langle e - 1 \rangle \oplus \mathbf{u}\langle 0 \rangle$ , see Lemma 5.1.



plaintext space). This lets us get a value of  $e'$  which is one larger than what we can get by adding only multiples of  $\tilde{q}$ , so we can extract one less digit. See details in Section 5.2.

### 3.2 Our Recryption Procedure

We optimize the GHS recryption procedure and extend it to handle plaintext spaces modulo arbitrary prime powers  $p^r$  rather than just  $p = 2, r = 1$ . The high-level structure of the procedure remains roughly the same.

To reduce the complexity as much as we can, we use a special recryption key  $\tilde{\mathbf{sk}} = (1, \tilde{\mathbf{s}})$ , which is chosen as sparse as possible (subject to security requirements). As we elaborate in Appendix A, the number of nonzero coefficients in  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$  plays an extremely important role in the complexity of recryption.<sup>5</sup>

To enable recryption of  $\text{mod-}p^r$  ciphertexts, we include in the public key a ciphertext  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}$  that encrypts the secret key  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$  relative to a large modulus  $Q$  and plaintext space  $\text{mod-}p^{e+r}$  for some  $e > r$ . Then given a  $\text{mod-}p^r$  ciphertext  $\mathbf{ct}$  to recrypt, we perform the following steps:

**Modulus-switching.** Convert  $\mathbf{ct}$  into another  $\mathbf{ct}'$  relative to the special modulus  $\tilde{q} = p^e + 1$ . We prove in Lemma 5.1 that for the special modulus  $\tilde{q}$ , the decryption procedure can be evaluated by computing  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow [\langle \mathbf{sk}, \mathbf{ct}' \rangle]_{p^{e+r}}$  and then  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \mathbf{u} \langle r-1, \dots, 0 \rangle_p - \mathbf{u} \langle e+r-1, \dots, e \rangle_p \pmod{p^r}$ .

**Optimization.** Add multiples of  $\tilde{q}$  and multiples of  $p^r$  to the coefficients of  $\mathbf{ct}'$ , making them divisible by  $p^{e'}$  for some  $r \leq e' < e$  without increasing them too much and also without increasing the noise too much. This is described in Section 5.2. The resulting ciphertext, which is divisible by  $p^{e'}$ , is denoted  $\mathbf{ct}'' = (\mathbf{c}_0'', \mathbf{c}_1'')$ . It follows from the same reasoning as above that we can now compute  $\mathbf{u}' \leftarrow [\langle \mathbf{sk}, \mathbf{ct}''/p^{e'} \rangle]_{p^{e-e'+r}}$  and then  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow -\mathbf{u}' \langle e-e'+r-1, \dots, e-e' \rangle_p \pmod{p^r}$ .

**Multiply by encrypted key.** Evaluate homomorphically the inner product (divided by  $p^{e'}$ ),  $\mathbf{u}' \leftarrow (\mathbf{c}_1' \cdot \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{c}_0')/p^{e'} \pmod{p^{e-e'+r}}$ , by setting  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}' \leftarrow (\mathbf{c}_1'/p^{e'}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{ct}} + (\mathbf{c}_0'/p^{e'}, 0)$ . The plaintext space of the resulting  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}'$  is modulo  $p^{e-e'+r}$ .

Note that since we only use plaintext space modulo  $p^{e-e'+r}$ , then we might as well use the same plaintext space also for  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}$ , rather than encrypting it relative to plaintext space modulo  $p^{e+r}$  as described above.

**Linear transformation.** Apply homomorphically a  $Z_{p^{e-e'+r}}$ -linear transformation to  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}'$ , converting it into ciphertexts that have the coefficients of  $\mathbf{u}'$  in the plaintext slots. This linear transformation, which is the most intricate part of the implementation, is described in Section 4. It uses a tensor decomposition similar to [1] to reduce complexity, but pays much closer attention to details such as the mult-by-constant depth and data movements.

**Digit extraction.** Apply a homomorphic (non-linear) digit-extraction procedure, computing  $r$  ciphertexts that contain the digits  $e-e'+r-1$  through  $e-e'$  of the integers in the slots, respectively, relative to plaintext space  $\text{mod-}p^r$ . This requires that we generalize the bit-extraction procedure from [16] to a digit-extraction procedure for any prime power  $p^r \geq 2$ , this is done in Section 5.3. Once we extracted all these digits, we can combine them to get an encryption of the coefficients of  $m$  in the slots relative to plaintext space modulo  $p^r$ .

<sup>5</sup>In our implementation we use a Hamming-weight-56 key, which is slightly smaller than the default Hamming-weight-64-keys that are used elsewhere in **HElib**.

**Inverse linear transformation.** Finally apply homomorphically the inverse linear transformation, this time over  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ , converting the ciphertext into an encryption  $\text{ct}^*$  of the plaintext element  $\mathbf{m}$  itself. This too is described in Section 4.

## 4 The Linear Transformations

In this section we describe the linear transformations that we apply during the decryption procedure to map the plaintext coefficients into the slots and back. Central to our implementation is imposing a hypercube structure on the plaintext space  $R_{p^r} = \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}[X]/(\Phi_m(X))$  with one dimension per factor of  $m$ , and implementing the second (inverse) transformation as a sequence of multi-point polynomial-evaluation operations, one for each dimension of the hypercube. We begin with some additional background.

### 4.1 Algebraic Background

Let  $m$  denote the parameter defining the underlying cyclotomic ring in an instance of the BGV cryptosystem with native plaintext space  $R_{p^r} = \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}[X]/(\Phi_m(X))$ . Throughout this section, we consider a particular factorization  $m = m_1 \cdots m_t$ , where the  $m_i$ 's are pairwise co-prime positive integers. We write  $\text{CRT}(h_1, \dots, h_t)$  for the unique solution  $h \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  to the system of congruences  $h \equiv h_i \pmod{m_i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, t$ ), where  $h_i \in \{0, \dots, m_i-1\}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, t$ .

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $p, m$  and the  $m_i$ 's be as above, where  $p$  is a prime not dividing any of the  $m_i$ 's. Let  $d_1$  be the order of  $p$  modulo  $m_1$  and for  $i = 2, \dots, t$  let  $d_i$  be the order of  $p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}}$  modulo  $m_i$ . Then the order of  $p$  modulo  $m$  is  $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_1 \cdots d_t$ .*

*Moreover, suppose that  $S_1, \dots, S_t$  are sets of integers such that each  $S_i \subseteq \{0, \dots, m_i-1\}$  forms a complete system of representatives for  $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i}^*/\langle p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}} \rangle$ . Then the set  $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{CRT}(S_1, \dots, S_t)$  forms a complete system of representatives for  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the lemma for  $t = 2$ . The general case follows by induction on  $t$ .

The fact that the order of  $p$  modulo  $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_1 m_2$  is  $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_1 d_2$  is clear by definition. The cardinality of  $S_1$  is  $\phi(m_1)/d_1$  and of  $S_2$  is  $\phi(m_2)/d_2$ , and so the cardinality of  $S$  is  $\phi(m_1)\phi(m_2)/d_1 d_2 = \phi(m)/d = |\mathbb{Z}_m^*/\langle p \rangle|$ . So it suffices to show that distinct elements of  $S$  belong to distinct cosets of  $\langle p \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$ .

To this end, let  $a, b \in S$ , and assume that  $p^f a \equiv b \pmod{m}$  for some nonnegative integer  $f$ . We want to show that  $a = b$ . Now, since the congruence  $p^f a \equiv b$  holds modulo  $m$ , it holds modulo  $m_1$  as well, and by the defining property of  $S_1$  and the construction of  $S$ , we must have  $a \equiv b \pmod{m_1}$ . So we may cancel  $a$  and  $b$  from both sides of the congruence  $p^f a \equiv b \pmod{m_1}$ , obtaining  $p^f \equiv 1 \pmod{m_1}$ , and from the defining property of  $d_1$ , we must have  $d_1 \mid f$ . Again, since the congruence  $p^f a \equiv b$  holds modulo  $m$ , it holds modulo  $m_2$  as well, and since  $d_1 \mid f$ , by the defining property of  $S_2$  and the construction of  $S$ , we must have  $a \equiv b \pmod{m_2}$ . It follows that  $a \equiv b \pmod{m}$ , and hence  $a = b$ .  $\square$

**The powerful basis.** The linear transformations in our decryption procedure make use of the same tensor decomposition that was used by Alperin-Sheriff and Peikert in [1], which in turn relies on the “powerful basis” representation of the plaintext space, due to Lyubashevsky et al. [23, 22]. The “powerful basis” representation is an isomorphism

$$R_{p^r} = \mathbb{Z}[X]/(p^r, \Phi_m(X)) \cong R'_{p^r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_t]/(p^r, \Phi_{m_1}(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{m_t}(X_t)),$$

defined explicitly by the map  $\text{PowToPoly} : R'_{p^r} \rightarrow R_{p^r}$  that sends (the residue class of)  $X_i$  to (the residue class of)  $X^{m/m_i}$ .

Recall that we view an element in the native plaintext space  $R_{p^r}$  as encoding a vector of plaintext slots from  $E$ , where  $E$  is an extension ring of  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  that contains a principal  $m$ th root of unity  $\zeta$ . Below let us define  $\zeta_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \zeta^{m/m_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ . It follows from the definitions above that for  $h = \text{CRT}(h_1, \dots, h_t)$  and  $\alpha = \text{PowToPoly}(\alpha')$ , we have  $\alpha(\zeta^h) = \alpha'(\zeta_1^{h_1}, \dots, \zeta_t^{h_t})$ .

Using Lemma 4.1, we can generalize the above to multi-point evaluation. Let  $S_1, \dots, S_t$  and  $S$  be sets as defined in the lemma. Then evaluating an element  $\alpha' \in R'_{p^r}$  at all points  $(\zeta_1^{h_1}, \dots, \zeta_t^{h_t})$ , where  $(h_1, \dots, h_t)$  ranges over  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_t$ , is equivalent to evaluating the corresponding element in  $\alpha \in R_{p^r}$  at all points  $\zeta^h$ , where  $h$  ranges over  $S$ .

## 4.2 The Evaluation Map

With the background above, we can now describe our implementation of the linear transformations. Recall that these transformations are needed to map the coefficients of the plaintext into the slots and back. Importantly, it is the powerful basis coefficients that we put in the slots during the first linear transformation, and take from the slots in the second transformation.

Since the two linear transformations are inverses of each other (except modulo different powers of  $p$ ), then once we have an implementation of one we also get an implementation of the other. For didactic reasons we begin by describing in detail the second transformation, and later we explain how to get from it also the implementation of the first transformation.

The second transformation begins with a plaintext element  $\beta$  that contains in its slots the powerful-basis coefficients of some other element  $\alpha$ , and ends with the element  $\alpha$  itself. Important to our implementation is the view of this transformation as *multi-point evaluation* of a polynomial. Namely, the second transformation begins with an element  $\beta$  whose slots contain the coefficients of the powerful basis  $\alpha' = \text{PowToPoly}(\alpha)$ , and ends with the element  $\alpha$  that holds in the slots the values

$$\alpha(\zeta^h) = \alpha'(\zeta_1^{h_1}, \dots, \zeta_t^{h_t})$$

where the  $h_i$ 's range over the  $S_i$ 's from Lemma 4.1 and correspondingly  $h$  range over  $S$ . Crucial to this view is that the CRT set  $S$  from Lemma 4.1 is the same as the representative-set  $S$  from Eqn. (2) that determines the plaintext slots.

**Choosing the representatives.** Our first order of business is therefore to match up the sets  $S$  from Eqn. (2) and Lemma 4.1. To facilitate this (and also other aspects of our implementation), we place some constraints on our choice of the parameter  $m$  and its factorization.<sup>6</sup> Recall that we consider the factorization  $m = m_1 \cdots m_t$ , and denote by  $d_i$  the order of  $p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}}$  modulo  $m_i$ .

- I. In choosing  $m$  and the  $m_i$ 's we restrict ourselves to the case where each group  $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i}^* / \langle p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}} \rangle$  is cyclic of order  $k_i$ , and let its generator be denoted by (the residue class of)  $\tilde{g}_i \in \{0, \dots, m_i - 1\}$ . Then for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ , we set  $S_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\tilde{g}_i^e \bmod m_i : 0 \leq e < k_i\}$ .

We define  $g_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{CRT}(1, \dots, 1, \tilde{g}_i, 1, \dots, 1)$  (with  $\tilde{g}_i$  in the  $i$ th position), and use the  $g_i$ 's as our hypercube basis with the order of  $g_i$  set to  $k_i$ . In this setting, the set  $S$  from Lemma 4.1 coincides with the set  $S$  in Eqn. (2); that is, we have  $S = \{\prod_{i=1}^t g_i^{e_i} \bmod m : 0 \leq e_i < k_i\} = \text{CRT}(S_1, \dots, S_t)$ .

- II. We further restrict ourselves to only use factorizations  $m = m_1 \cdots m_t$  for which  $d_1 = d$ . (That is, the order of  $p$  is the same in  $\mathbb{Z}_{m_1}^*$  as in  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$ .) With this assumption, we have  $d_2 = \dots = d_t = 1$ , and moreover  $k_1 = \phi(m_1)/d$  and  $k_i = \phi(m_i)$  for  $i = 2, \dots, t$ .

---

<sup>6</sup>As we discuss in Section 6, there are still sufficiently many settings that satisfy these requirements.

Note that with the above assumptions, the first dimension could be either good or bad, but the other dimensions  $2, \dots, t$  are always good. This is because  $p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ , so also  $p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}} \equiv 1 \pmod{m_i}$ , and therefore  $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i}^* / \langle p^{d_1 \cdots d_{i-1}} \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}^*$ , which means that the order of  $g_i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$  (which is the same as the order of  $\tilde{g}_i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i}^*$ ) equals  $k_i$ .

**Packing the coefficients.** In designing the linear transformation, we have the freedom to choose how we want the coefficients of  $\alpha'$  to be packed in the slots of  $\beta$ . Let us denote these coefficients by  $c_{j_1, \dots, j_t}$  where each index  $j_i$  runs over  $\{0, \dots, \phi(m_i) - 1\}$ , and each  $c_{j_1, \dots, j_t}$  is in  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ . That is, we have

$$\alpha'(X_1, \dots, X_t) = \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_t} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} X_1^{j_1} X_2^{j_2} \cdots X_t^{j_t} = \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_t} \left( \sum_{j_1} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} X_1^{j_1} \right) X_2^{j_2} \cdots X_t^{j_t}.$$

Recall that we can pack  $d$  coefficients into a slot, so for fixed  $j_2, \dots, j_t$ , we can pack the  $\phi(m_1)$  coefficients of the polynomial  $\sum_{j_1} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} X_1^{j_1}$  into  $k_1 = \phi(m_1)/d$  slots. In our implementation we pack these coefficients into the slots indexed by  $(e_1, j_2, \dots, j_t)$ , for  $e_1 = 0, \dots, k_1 - 1$ . That is, we pack them into a single hypercolumn in dimension 1.

#### 4.2.1 The Eval Transformation

The second (inverse) linear transformation of the decryption procedure begins with the element  $\beta$  whose slots pack the coefficients  $c_{j_1, \dots, j_t}$  as above. The desired output from this transformation is the element whose slots contain  $\alpha(\zeta^h)$  for all  $h \in S$  (namely the element  $\alpha$  itself). Specifically, we need each slot of  $\alpha$  with hypercube index  $(e_1, \dots, e_t)$  to hold the value

$$\alpha'(\zeta_1^{g_1^{e_1}}, \dots, \zeta_t^{g_t^{e_t}}) = \alpha(\zeta_1^{g_1^{e_1} \cdots g_t^{e_t}}).$$

Below we denote  $\zeta_{i, e_i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \zeta_i^{g_i^{e_i}}$ . We transform  $\beta$  into  $\alpha$  in  $t$  stages, each of which can be viewed as multi-point evaluation of polynomials along one dimension of the hypercube.

**Stage 1.** This stage begins with the element  $\beta$ , in which each dimension-1 hypercolumn with index  $(\star, j_2, \dots, j_t)$  contains the coefficients of the univariate polynomial  $P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(X_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j_1} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} X_1^{j_1}$ . We transform  $\beta$  into  $\beta_1$  where that hypercolumn contains the evaluation of the same polynomial in many points. Specifically, the slot of  $\beta_1$  indexed by  $(e_1, j_2, \dots, j_t)$  contains the value  $P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{1, e_1})$ .

By definition, this stage consists of parallel application of a particular  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear transformation  $M_1$  (namely a multi-point polynomial evaluation map) to each of the  $k/k_1$  hypercolumns in dimension 1. In other words,  $M_1$  maps  $(k_1 \cdot d)$ -dimensional vectors over  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  (each packed into  $k_1$  slots) to  $k_1$ -dimensional vectors over  $E$ . We elaborate on the efficient implementation of this stage later in this section.

**Stages 2,  $\dots$ ,  $t$ .** The element  $\beta_1$  from the previous stage holds in its slots the coefficients of the  $k_1$  multivariate polynomials  $A_{e_1}(\cdot)$  (for  $e_1 = 0, \dots, k_1 - 1$ ),

$$A_{e_1}(X_2, \dots, X_t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha'(\zeta_{1, e_1}, X_2, \dots, X_t) = \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_t} \underbrace{\left( \sum_{j_1} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} \zeta_{1, e_1}^{j_1} \right)}_{\text{slot } (e_1, j_2, \dots, j_t) = P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{1, e_1})} X_2^{j_2} \cdots X_t^{j_t}.$$

The goal in the remaining stages is to implement multi-point evaluation of these polynomials at all the points  $X_i = \zeta_{i, e_i}$  for  $0 \leq e_i < k_i$ . Note that differently from the polynomial  $\alpha'$  that we started with, the polynomials  $A_{e_1}$  have coefficients from  $E$  (rather than from  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ ), and these coefficients are

encoded one per slot (rather than  $d$  per slot). As we explain later, this makes it easier to implement the desired multi-point evaluation. Separating out the second dimension we can write

$$A_{e_1}(X_2, \dots, X_t) = \sum_{j_3, \dots, j_t} \left( \sum_{j_2} P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{1, e_1}) X_2^{j_2} \right) X_3^{j_3} \dots X_t^{j_t}.$$

We note that each dimension-2 hypercolumn in  $\beta_1$  with index  $(e_1, \star, j_3, \dots, j_t)$  contains the  $E$ -coefficients of the univariate polynomial  $Q_{e_1, j_3, \dots, j_t}(X_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j_2} P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{1, e_1}) X_2^{j_2}$ . In Stage 2, we transform  $\beta_1$  into  $\beta_2$  where that hypercolumn contains the evaluation of the same polynomial in many points. Specifically, the slot of  $\beta_2$  indexed by  $(e_1, e_2, j_3, \dots, j_t)$  contains the value

$$Q_{e_1, j_3, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{2, e_2}) = \sum_{j_2} P_{j_2, \dots, j_t}(\zeta_{1, e_1}) \cdot \zeta_{2, e_2}^{j_2} = \sum_{j_1, j_2} c_{j_1, \dots, j_t} \zeta_{1, e_1}^{j_1} \zeta_{2, e_2}^{j_2},$$

and the following stages implement the multi-point evaluation of these polynomials at all the points  $X_i = \zeta_{i, e_i}$  for  $0 \leq e_i < k_i$ .

Stages  $s = 3, \dots, t$  proceed analogously to Stage 2, each time eliminating a single variable  $X_s$  via the parallel application of an  $E$ -linear map  $M_s$  to each of the  $k/k_s$  hypercolumns in dimension  $s$ . When all of these stages are completed, we have in every slot with index  $(e_1, \dots, e_t)$  the value  $\alpha'(\zeta_{1, e_1}, \dots, \zeta_{t, e_t})$ , as needed.

**Implementing stages 2,  $\dots$ ,  $t$ .** For  $s = 2, \dots, t$ , we obtain  $\beta_s$  from  $\beta_{s-1}$  by applying the linear transformation  $M_s$  in parallel to each hypercolumn in dimension  $s$ . We adapt for that purpose the **HElib** matrix-multiplication procedure [18], using only rotations along dimension  $s$ . The procedure from [18] multiplies an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  by a  $n \times 1$  column vector  $v$  by computing

$$Mv = D_0 v_0 + \dots + D_{n-1} v_{n-1}, \quad (3)$$

where each  $v_i$  is the vector obtained by rotating the entries of  $v$  by  $i$  positions, and each  $D_i$  is a diagonal matrix containing one diagonal of  $M$ . In our case, we perform  $k/k_s$  such computations in parallel, one on every hypercolumn along the  $s$  dimension, implementing the rotations using the  $\rho_s^e$  maps. That is, we set

$$\beta_s = \sum_{e=0}^{k_s-1} \kappa_{s,e} \cdot \rho_s^e(\beta_{s-1}), \quad (4)$$

where the  $\kappa_{s,e}$ 's are constants in  $R_{p^r}$  obtained by embedding appropriate constants in  $E$  in each slot. Eqn. (4) translates directly into a simple homomorphic evaluation algorithm, just by applying the same operations to the ciphertexts. The cost in time for stage  $s$  is  $k_s - 1$  automorphisms and  $k_s$  constant-ciphertext multiplications; the cost in depth is a single constant-ciphertext multiplication.

**Implementing stage 1.** Stage 1 is more challenging, because the map  $M_1$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear map, rather than an  $E$ -linear map. Nevertheless, we can still use the same diagonal decomposition as in Eqn. (3), except that the entries in the diagonal matrices are no longer elements of  $E$ , but rather,  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear maps on  $E$ . These maps may be encoded using linearized polynomials, as in Section 2.4, allowing us to write

$$\beta_1 = \sum_{e=0}^{k_1-1} \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \lambda_{e,f} \cdot \sigma^f(\rho_1^e(\beta)), \quad (5)$$

where the  $\lambda_{e,f}$ 's are constants in  $R_{p^r}$ .

A naive homomorphic implementation of the formula from Eqn. (5) takes  $O(dk_1)$  automorphisms, but we can reduce this to  $O(d + k_1)$  as follows. Since  $\sigma^f$  is a ring automorphism, it commutes with addition and multiplication, so we can rewrite Eqn. (5) as follows:

$$\beta_1 = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \sum_{e=0}^{k_1-1} \sigma^f \left( \sigma^{-f}(\lambda_{e,f}) \cdot \rho_1^e(\beta) \right) = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \sigma^f \left( \sum_{e=0}^{k_1-1} \sigma^{-f}(\lambda_{e,f}) \cdot \rho_1^e(\beta) \right). \quad (6)$$

To evaluate Eqn. (6) homomorphically, we compute encryptions of  $\rho_1^e(\beta)$  for  $e = 0, \dots, k_1 - 1$ , then take  $d$  different linear combinations of these values, homomorphically computing

$$\gamma_f = \sum_{e=0}^{k_1-1} \sigma^{-f}(\lambda_{e,f}) \cdot \rho_1^e(\beta) \quad (f = 0, \dots, d-1).$$

Finally, we can compute an encryption of  $\beta_1 = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \sigma^f(\gamma_f)$  by applying Frobenius maps to the ciphertexts encrypting the  $\gamma_f$ 's, and summing.

If dimension 1 is good, the homomorphic computation of the  $\gamma_f$ 's takes the time of  $k_1 - 1$  automorphisms and  $k_1 d$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, and the depth of one constant-ciphertext multiplication. If dimension 1 is bad, we can maintain the same depth by folding the multiplication by the constants  $\sigma^{-f}(\lambda_{e,f})$  into the masks used for rotation (see Section 2.3); the time increases to  $2(k_1 - 1)$  automorphisms and  $(2k_1 - 1)d$  constant-ciphertext multiplications.

The entire procedure to compute an encryption of  $\beta_1$  has depth of one constant-ciphertext multiplication, and it takes time  $k_1 + d - 2 + B(k_1 - 1)$  automorphisms and  $k_1 d + B(k_1 - 1)d$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, where  $B$  is a flag which is 1 if dimension 1 is bad and 0 if it is good.

**Complexity of Eval.** From the above, we get the following cost estimates for computing the Eval map homomorphically. The depth is  $t$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, and the time is at most

- $(B + 1)\phi(m_1)/d + d + \phi(m_1) + \dots + \phi(m_t)$  automorphisms, and
- $(B + 1)\phi(m_1) + \phi(m_2) + \dots + \phi(m_t)$  constant-ciphertext multiplications.

#### 4.2.2 The Transformation Eval<sup>-1</sup>

The first linear transformation in the decryption procedure is the inverse of Eval. This transformation can be implemented by simply running the above stages in reverse order and using the inverse linear maps  $M_s^{-1}$  in place of  $M_s$ . The complexity estimates are identical.

### 4.3 Unpacking and Repacking the Slots

In our decryption procedure we have the non-linear digit extraction routine “sandwiched” between the linear evaluation map and its inverse. However the evaluation map transformations from above maintain fully-packed ciphertexts, where each slot contains an element of the extension ring  $E$  (of degree  $d$ ), while our digit extraction routine needs “sparsely packed” slots containing only integers from  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ .

Therefore, before we can use the digit extraction procedure we need to “unpack” the slots, so as to get  $d$  ciphertexts in which each slot contains a single coefficient in the constant term. Similarly, after digit extraction we have to “repack” the slots, before running the second transformation.

**Unpacking.** Consider the unpacking procedure in terms of the element  $\beta \in R_{p^r}$ . Each slot of  $\beta$  contains an element of  $E$  which we write as  $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} a_i \zeta^i$  with the  $a_i$ 's in  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ . We want to compute  $\beta^{(0)}, \dots, \beta^{(d-1)}$ , so that the corresponding slot of each  $\beta^{(i)}$  contains  $a_i$ . To obtain  $\beta^{(i)}$ , we need to apply to each slot of  $\beta$  the  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear map  $L_i : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  that maps  $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} a_i \zeta^i$  to  $a_i$ .

Using linearized polynomials, as discussed in Section 2.4, we may write  $\beta^{(i)} = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \kappa_{i,f} \sigma^f(\beta)$ , for constants  $\kappa_{i,f} \in R_{p^r}$ . Given an encryption of  $\beta$ , we can compute encryptions of all of the  $\sigma^f(\beta)$ 's and then take linear combinations of these to get encryptions of all of the  $\beta^{(i)}$ 's. This takes the time of  $d - 1$  automorphisms and  $d^2$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, and a depth of one constant-ciphertext multiplication.

While the cost in time of constant-ciphertext multiplications is relatively cheap, it cannot be ignored, especially as we have to compute  $d^2$  of them. In our implementation, the cost is dominated the time it takes to convert an element in  $R_{p^r}$  to its corresponding DoubleCRT representation. It is possible, of course, to precompute and store all  $d^2$  of these constants in DoubleCRT format, but the space requirement is significant: for typical parameters, our implementation takes about 4MB to store a single constant in DoubleCRT format, so for example with  $d = 24$ , these constants take up almost 2.5GB of space.

This unappealing space/time trade-off can be improved considerably using somewhat more sophisticated implementations. Suppose that in the first linear transformation  $\text{Eval}^{-1}$ , instead of packing the coefficients  $a_0, \dots, a_{d-1}$  into a slot as  $\sum_i a_i \zeta^i$ , we pack them as  $\sum_i a_i \sigma_E^i(\theta)$ , where  $\theta \in E$  is a normal element. Further, let  $L'_0 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear map that sends  $\eta = \sum_i a_i \sigma_E^i(\theta)$  to  $a_0$ . Then we have  $L'_0(\sigma^{-j}(\eta)) = a_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, d - 1$ . If we realize the map  $L'_0$  with linearized polynomials, and if the plaintext  $\gamma$  has the coefficients packed into slots via a normal element as above, then we have  $\beta^{(i)} = \sum_{f=0}^{d-1} \kappa_f \cdot \sigma^{f-i}(\gamma)$ , where the  $\kappa_f$ 's are constants in  $R_{p^r}$ . So we have only  $d$  constants rather than  $d^2$ .

To use this strategy, however, we must address the issue of how to modify the  $\text{Eval}$  transformation so that  $\text{Eval}^{-1}$  will give us the plaintext element  $\gamma$  that packs coefficients as  $\sum_i a_i \sigma_E^i(\theta)$ . As it turns out, in our implementation this modification is for free: recall that the unpacking transformation immediately follows the last stage of the inverse evaluation map  $\text{Eval}^{-1}$ , and that last stage applies  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear maps to the slots; therefore, we simply fold into these maps the  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ -linear map that takes  $\sum_i a_i \zeta^i$  to  $\sum_i a_i \sigma_E^i(\theta)$  in each slot.

It is possible to reduce the number of stored constants even further: since  $L'_0$  is a map from  $E$  to the base ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ , then the  $\kappa_f$ 's are related via  $\kappa_f = \sigma^f(\kappa_0)$ . Therefore, we can obtain all of the DoubleCRTs for the  $\kappa_f$ 's by computing just one for  $\kappa_0$  and then applying the Frobenius automorphisms directly to the DoubleCRT for  $\kappa_0$ . We note, however, that applying these automorphisms directly to DoubleCRTs leads to a slight increase in the noise of the homomorphic computation. We did not use this last optimization in our implementation.

**Repacking.** Finally, we discuss the reverse transformation, which repacks the slots, taking  $\beta^{(0)}, \dots, \beta^{(d-1)}$  to  $\beta$ . This is quite straightforward: if  $\bar{\zeta}$  is the plaintext element with  $\zeta$  in each slot, then  $\beta = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \bar{\zeta}^i \beta^{(i)}$ . This formula can be evaluated homomorphically with a cost in time of  $d$  constant-ciphertext multiplications, and a cost in depth one constant-ciphertext multiplication.

## 5 Recryption with Plaintext Space Modulo $p > 2$

Below we extend the treatment from [16, 1] to handle plaintext spaces modulo  $p > 2$ . In Sections 5.1 through 5.3 we generalize the various lemmas to  $p > 2$ , in Appendix A we discuss the choice of parameters, and then in Section 5.4 we explain how these lemmas are put together in the decryption procedure.

## 5.1 Simpler Decryption Formula

We begin by extending the simplified decryption formula [16, Lemma 1] from plaintext space mod-2 to any prime-power  $p^r$ . Recall that we denote by  $[z]_q$  the mod- $q$  reduction into  $[-q/2, q/2)$  (except when  $q = 2$  we reduce to  $(-1, 1]$ ). Also  $z\langle j, \dots, i \rangle_p$  denotes the integer whose mod- $p$  expansion consists of digits  $i$  through  $j$  in the mod- $p$  expansion of  $z$  (and we omit the  $p$  subscript if it is clear from the context).

**Lemma 5.1** *Let  $p > 1, r \geq 1, e \geq r + 2$  and  $q = p^e + 1$  be integers, and also let  $z$  be an integer such that  $|z| \leq \frac{q^2}{4} - q$  and  $|[z]_q| \leq \frac{q}{4}$ .*

- *If  $p$  is odd then  $[z]_q = z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle \pmod{p^r}$ .*
- *If  $p = 2$  then  $[z]_q = z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle - z\langle e - 1 \rangle \pmod{2^r}$ .*

*Proof.* We begin with the odd- $p$  case. Denote  $z_0 = [z]_q$ , then  $z = z_0 + kq$  for some  $|k| \leq \frac{q}{4} - 1$ , and hence  $|z_0 + k| \leq \frac{q}{4} + \frac{q}{4} - 1 = (q - 2)/2 = (p^e - 1)/2$ . We can write

$$z = z_0 + kq = z_0 + k(p^e + 1) = z_0 + k + p^e k. \quad (7)$$

This means in particular that  $z = z_0 + k \pmod{p^r}$ , and also since the mod- $p$  representation of the sum  $w = z_0 + k$  has only 0's in positions  $e$  and up then  $k\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle = z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle$ . It follows that

$$z_0\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle = z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - k\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle = z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle \pmod{p^r}.$$

The proof for the  $p = 2$  case is similar, but we no longer have the guarantee that the high-order bits of the sum  $w = z_0 + k$  are all zero. Hence from Eqn. (7) we can only deduce that

$$z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle = w\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle + k\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle \pmod{2^r},$$

and also that  $z\langle e - 1 \rangle = w\langle e - 1 \rangle$ .

Since  $|w| \leq |z_0| + |k| < \lfloor q/2 \rfloor = 2^{e-1}$ , then the bits in positions  $e - 1$  and up in the representation of  $w$  are either all zero if  $w \geq 0$ , or all one if  $w < 0$ . In particular, this means that

$$w\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } w < 0 \end{cases} = -w\langle e - 1 \rangle = -z\langle e - 1 \rangle \pmod{2^r}.$$

Concluding, we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} z_0\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle &= z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - k\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle \\ &= z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - (z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle - w\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle) \\ &= z\langle r - 1, \dots, 0 \rangle - z\langle e + r - 1, \dots, e \rangle - z\langle e - 1 \rangle \pmod{2^r}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 5.2 Making an Integer Divisible By $p^{e'}$

As sketched in Section 3, we use the following lemma to reduce to number of digits that needs to be extracted, hence reducing the time and depth of the digit-extraction step.



**Lemma 5.2** *Let  $z$  be an integer, and let  $p, q, r, e'$  be positive integers s.t.  $e' \geq r$  and  $q = 1 \pmod{p^{e'}}$ . Also let  $\alpha$  be an arbitrary real number in  $[0, 1]$ . Then there are integer coefficients  $u, v$  such that*

$$z + u \cdot p^r + v \cdot q = 0 \pmod{p^{e'}}$$

*and moreover  $u, v$  are small. Specifically  $|v| \leq p^r(\frac{1}{2} + \lfloor (1 - \alpha)p^{e'-1}/2 \rfloor)$  and  $|u| \leq \lceil \alpha p^{e'-1}/2 \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $q, p$  are co-prime then there exists  $v' \in (-p^r/2, p^r/2]$  s.t.  $z' = z + v'q = 0 \pmod{p^r}$ . Let  $\delta = -z' \cdot p^{-r} \pmod{p^{e'-1}}$ , reduced into the interval  $[-\frac{p^{e'-1}}{2}, \frac{p^{e'-1}}{2}]$ , so we have  $|\delta| \leq p^{e'-1}/2$  and  $z' + p^r\delta = 0 \pmod{p^{e'}}$ . Denote  $\beta = 1 - \alpha$  and consider the integer

$$z'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z' + \lceil \alpha \delta \rceil \cdot p^r + \lfloor \beta \delta \rfloor p^r \cdot q.$$

On one hand, we have that  $z'' = z + u \cdot p^r + v \cdot q$  with  $|u| = |\lceil \alpha \delta \rceil| \leq \lceil \alpha p^{e'-1}/2 \rceil$  and  $|v| = |v' + p^r \lfloor \beta \delta \rfloor| \leq p^r(\frac{1}{2} + \lfloor \beta p^{e'-1}/2 \rfloor)$ . On the other hand since  $q = 1 \pmod{p^{e'}}$  then we also have  $z'' = z' + p^r(\lceil \alpha \delta \rceil + \lfloor \beta \delta \rfloor) = z' + p^r\delta = 0 \pmod{p^{e'}}$ .  $\square$

**Discussion.** Recall that in our decryption procedure we have a ciphertext  $\text{ct}$  that encrypts some  $\mathbf{m}$  with respect to modulus  $q$  and plaintext space  $\text{mod-}p^r$ , and we use the lemma above to convert it into another ciphertext  $\text{ct}'$  that encrypts the same thing but is divisible by  $p^{e'}$ , and by doing so we need to extract  $e'$  fewer digits in the digit-extraction step.

Considering the elements  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow \langle \text{sk}, \text{ct} \rangle$  and  $\mathbf{u}' \leftarrow \langle \text{sk}, \text{ct}' \rangle$  (without any modular reduction), since  $\text{sk}$  is integral then adding multiples of  $q$  to the coefficients of  $\text{ct}$  does not change  $[\mathbf{u}]_q$ , and also as long as we do not wrap around  $q$  then adding multiples of  $p^r$  does not change  $[[\mathbf{u}]_q]_{p^r}$ . Hence as long as we only add small multiples of  $p^r$  then we have  $[[\mathbf{u}]_q]_{p^r} = [[\mathbf{u}']_q]_{p^r}$ , so  $\text{ct}$  and  $\text{ct}'$  still encrypt the same plaintext. However in our decryption procedure we need more: to use our simpler decryption formula from Lemma 5.1 we not only need the noise magnitude  $\|[\mathbf{u}']_q\|$  to be smaller than  $\frac{q}{4}$ , but the magnitude of  $\mathbf{u}'$  itself (before  $\text{mod-}q$  reduction) must be smaller than  $\frac{q^2}{4} - q$ .

In essence, the two types of additive terms consume two types of “resources:” adding multiples of  $q$  increases the magnitude of  $\mathbf{u}'$ , and adding multiple of  $p^r$  increases the magnitude of  $[\mathbf{u}']_q$ . The parameter  $\alpha$  from Lemma 5.2 above lets us trade-off these two resources: smaller  $\alpha$  means slower increase in  $\|[\mathbf{u}']_q\|$  but faster increase in  $\|\mathbf{u}'\|$ , and vice versa for larger  $\alpha$ . As we discuss in Appendix A, the best trade-off is often obtained when  $\alpha$  is just under  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; our implementation tries to optimize this parameter, and for many settings it uses  $\alpha \approx 0.45$ .

### 5.3 Digit-Extraction for Plaintext Space Modulo $p^r$

The bit-extraction procedure that was described by Gentry et al. in [16] and further optimized by Alperin-Sheriff and Peikert in [1] is specific for the case  $p = 2^e$ . Namely, for an input ciphertext relative to  $\text{mod-}2^e$  plaintext space, encrypting some integer  $z$  (in one of the slots), this procedure computes the  $i$ th top bit of  $z$  (in the same slot), relative to plaintext space  $\text{mod-}2^{e-i+1}$ . Below we show how to extend this bit-extraction procedure to a digit-extraction also when  $p$  is an odd prime.

The main observation underlying the original bit-extraction procedure, is that squaring an integer keeps the least-significant bit unchanged but inserts zeros in the higher-order bits. Namely, if  $b$  is the least significant bit of the integer  $z$  and moreover  $z = b \pmod{2^e}$ ,  $e \geq 1$ , then squaring  $z$  we get  $z^2 = b \pmod{2^{e+1}}$ . Therefore,  $z - z^2$  is divisible by  $2^e$ , and the LSB of  $(z - z^2)/2^e$  is the  $e$ th bit of  $z$ .

Unfortunately the same does not hold when using a base  $p > 2$ . Instead, we show below that for any exponent  $e$  there exists some degree- $p$  polynomial  $F_e(\cdot)$  (but not necessarily  $F_e(X) = X^p$ ) such that when  $z = z_0 \pmod{p^e}$  then  $F_e(z) = z_0 \pmod{p^{e+1}}$ . Hence  $z - F_e(z)$  is divisible by  $p^e$ , and the least-significant digit of  $(z - F_e(z))/p^e$  is the  $e$ th digit of  $z$ . The existence of such polynomial  $F_e(X)$  follows from the simple derivation below.

Digit-Extraction<sub>p</sub>(z, e):     // Extract eth digit in base- $p$  representation of  $z$

1.  $w_{0,0} \leftarrow z$
2. For  $k = 0$  to  $e - 1$
3.      $y \leftarrow z$
4.     For  $j = 0$  to  $k$
5.          $w_{j,k+1} \leftarrow F_e(w_{j,k})$  //  $F_e$  from Corollary 5.5, for  $p = 2, 3$  we have  $F_e(X) = X^p$
6.          $y \leftarrow (y - w_{j,k+1})/p$
7.      $w_{k+1,k+1} \leftarrow y$
8. Return  $w_{e,e}$

Figure 1: The digit extraction procedure

**Lemma 5.3** *For every prime  $p$  and exponent  $e \geq 1$ , and every integer  $z$  of the form  $z = z_0 + p^e z_1$  (with  $z_0, z_1$  integers,  $z_0 \in [p]$ ), it holds that  $z^p = z_0 \pmod{p}$ , and  $z^p = z_0^p \pmod{p^{e+1}}$ .*

*Proof.* The first equality is obvious, and the proof of the second equality is just by the binomial expansion of  $(z_0 + p^e z_1)^p$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.4** *For every prime  $p$  there exist a sequence of integer polynomials  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ , all of degree  $\leq p - 1$ , such that for every exponent  $e \geq 1$  and every integer  $z = z_0 + p^e z_1$  (with  $z_0, z_1$  integers,  $z_0 \in [p]$ ), we have*

$$z^p = z_0 + \sum_{i=1}^e f_i(z_0) p^i \pmod{p^{e+1}}.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 5.3 we know that the mod- $p$  digits of  $z^p$  modulo- $p^{e+1}$  depend only on  $z_0$ , so there exist some polynomials in  $z_0$  that describe them,  $f_i(z_0) = z^p \langle i \rangle_p$ . Since these  $f_i$ 's are polynomials from  $Z_p$  to itself, then they have degree at most  $p - 1$ . Moreover, by the 1st equality in Lemma 5.3 we have that the first digit is exactly  $z_0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.5** *For every prime  $p$  and every  $e \geq 1$  there exist a degree- $p$  polynomial  $F_e$ , such that for every integers  $z_0, z_1$  with  $z_0 \in [p]$  and every  $1 \leq e' \leq e$  we have  $F_e(z_0 + p^{e'} z_1) = z_0 \pmod{p^{e'+1}}$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $z = z_0 + p^{e'} z_1$ . Since  $z = z_0 \pmod{p^{e'}}$  then  $f_i(z_0) = f_i(z) \pmod{p^{e'}}$ . This implies that for all  $i \geq 1$  we have  $f_i(z_0) p^i = f_i(z) p^i \pmod{p^{e'+1}}$ , and of course also for  $i \geq e' + 1$  we have  $f_i(z) p^i = 0 \pmod{p^{e'+1}}$ . Therefore, setting  $F_e(X) = X^p - \sum_{i=1}^e f_i(X) p^i$  we get

$$F_e(z) = z^p - \sum_{i=1}^e f_i(z) p^i = z^p - \sum_{i=1}^{e'} f_i(z_0) p^i = z_0 \pmod{p^{e'+1}}.$$

$\square$

We know that for  $p = 2$  we have  $F_e(X) = X^2$  for all  $e$ . One can verify that also for  $p = 3$  we have  $F_e(X) = X^3$  for all  $e$  (when considering the balanced mod-3 representation), but for larger primes we no longer have  $F_e(X) = X^p$ .

**The digit-extraction procedure.** Just like in the base-2 case, in the procedure for extracting the eth base- $p$  digit from the integer  $z = \sum_i z_i p^i$  proceeds by computing integers  $w_{j,k}$  ( $k \geq j$ ) such that the lowest digit in  $w_{j,k}$  is  $z_j$ , and the next  $k - j$  digits are zeros. The code in Figure 1 is purposely written to be similar to the code from [1, Appendix B], with the only difference being in Line 5 where we use  $F_e(X)$  rather than  $X^2$ .

In our implementation we compute the coefficients of the polynomial  $F_e$  once and store them for future use. In the procedure itself, we apply a homomorphic polynomial-evaluation procedure to

compute  $F_e(w_{j,k})$  in Line 5. We note that just as in [16, 1], the homomorphic division-by- $p$  operation is done by multiplying the ciphertext by the constant  $p^{-1} \bmod q$ , where  $q$  is the current modulus. Since the encrypted values are guaranteed to be divisible by  $p$ , then this has the desired effect and also it reduces the noise magnitude by a factor of  $p$ . Correctness of the procedure from Figure 1 is proved exactly the same way as in [16, 1], the proof is omitted here.

### 5.3.1 An optimization for $p = 2$ , $r \geq 2$ .

As it turns out, for  $p = 2$  we can sometimes extract several consecutive bits a little cheaper than what the procedure above implies. Specifically, it turns out that for  $p = 2, e \geq 0$  and  $r \geq 2$  we can compute the integer  $z\langle e + r, \dots, e \rangle$  by extracting only  $e + r - 1$  bits (rather than  $e + r$  of them). Specifically, when applying the procedure from Figure 1 (which for  $p = 2$  is identical to the one from [1, Appendix B]), it turns out that we get

$$z\langle e + r, \dots, e \rangle = \sum_{j=r}^{e+r-1} 2^{j-r} w_{j,e+r-1} \pmod{2^{e+r+1}}.$$

Note: the above would have been an immediate corollary from the correctness of the bit-extraction procedure if we added the terms  $2^{j-r} w_{j,e+r}$  and let the index  $j$  go up to  $e + r$ , but in this case we can stop one step earlier and the result still holds.

To see why this works, observe that (by correctness), when we assign  $w_{k+1,k+1} \leftarrow y$  in line 7 then it must be the case that  $LSB(y) = z\langle k + 1 \rangle$ , and in subsequent iterations we just square  $w_{k+1}$  so as to get more zeros in higher-order bits, without changing the LSB. Recall also that squaring indeed has the desired effect since for any  $i \geq 1$  and any bit  $b$  and integer  $n$  we have  $(b + 2^i n)^2 = b \pmod{2^{i+1}}$ . To prove the optimization, we need two additional observations:

**Observation 1.** *For any bit  $b$  and integer  $n$  we have  $(b + 2n)^4 = b \pmod{16}$ .*

Note that this is *not a corollary* of the squaring property above — that property only gives  $b \pmod{8}$ , but in fact for this particular case we get one extra zero. (This holds only in this particular step, for later steps we only get one additional zero per squaring.)

**Observation 2.** *After line 7 in Figure 1, we always have  $z = \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} 2^j w_{j,k+1}$ .*

This can be verified by inspection: we start in line 3 from  $y = z$ , and at every step we subtract one  $w_j$  and divide by two, so adding them back with their respective powers of two gives back  $z$ .

Correctness now follows: Let us denote  $w_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w_{j,e+r-1}$  so we will not have to carry this extra index everywhere. Because of the first observation, the  $w_j$ 's for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, e + r - 3$  have an extra zero bit, so for these  $w_j$ 's we have  $w_j = z\langle j \rangle \pmod{2^{e+r-j+1}}$ , not just  $\pmod{2^{e+r-j}}$ . Denoting  $v_j = 2^j w_j$ , this means that the only  $v_j$ 's that potentially have a nonzero bit in position  $e + r$  are  $v_{e+r-2}$  and  $v_{e+r-1}$ . Also by correctness, for lower bit positions  $j < e + r$ , only  $v_j$  potentially has nonzero bit in position  $j$ , and all the other  $v_j$ 's have zero in that position. Namely, we have

bit position:	★	$e + r$	$e + r - 1$	$e + r - 2$	$e + r - 3$	...	1	0
$v_0 = w_0 =$	★	0	0	0	0		0	$z\langle 0 \rangle$
$v_1 = 2w_1 =$	★	0	0	0	0		$z\langle 1 \rangle$	0
	⋮					⋮		
$v_{e+r-3} = 2^{e+r-3} w_{e+r-3} =$	★	0	0	0	$z\langle e + r - 3 \rangle$		0	0
$v_{e+r-2} = 2^{e+r-2} w_{e+r-2} =$	★	$\sigma$	0	$z\langle e + r - 2 \rangle$	0		0	0
$v_{e+r-1} = 2^{e+r-1} w_{e+r-1} =$	★	$\tau$	$z\langle e + r - 1 \rangle$	0	0		0	0

for some two bits  $\sigma, \tau$  (where the ★'s are bits above position  $e + r$ , which we do not care about).

This means that when adding  $\sum_{j=0}^{e+r-1} v_j$ , we have no carry bits up to position  $e+r$ . But by the second observation the sum of all these  $v_j$ 's is  $z$ , so the two top bits  $\sigma, \tau$  must satisfy  $\sigma \oplus \tau = z \langle e+r \rangle$ . We conclude that when adding  $\sum_{j=e}^{e+r-1} v_j$ , we get all the bits  $z \langle e+r, \dots, e \rangle$  which is what we needed to prove.

## 5.4 Putting Everything Together

Having described all separate parts of our decryption procedure, we now explain how they are combined in our implementation.

**Initialization and parameters.** Given the ring parameter  $m$  (that specifies the  $m$ th cyclotomic ring of integers  $R = \mathbb{Z}[X]/(\Phi_m(X))$ ) and the plaintext space  $p^r$ , we compute the decryption parameters as explained in Appendix A. That is, we use compute the Hamming weight of decryption secret key  $t \geq 56$ , some value of  $\alpha$  (which is often  $\alpha \approx 0.45$ ), and some values for  $e, e'$  where  $e - e' - r \in \{\lceil \log_p(t+2) \rceil - 1, \lceil \log_p(t+2) \rceil\}$ . We also precompute some key-independent tables for use in the linear transformations, with the first transformation using plaintext space  $p^{e-e'+r}$  and the second transformation using plaintext space  $p^r$ .

**Key generation.** During key generation we choose in addition to the “standard” secret key  $\mathbf{sk}$  also a separate secret decryption key  $\tilde{\mathbf{sk}} = (1, \tilde{\mathbf{s}})$ , with  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$  having Hamming weight  $t$ . We include in the secret key both a key-switching matrix from  $\mathbf{sk}$  to  $\tilde{\mathbf{sk}}$ , and a ciphertext  $\tilde{\mathbf{ct}}$  that encrypts  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$  under key  $\mathbf{sk}$ , relative to plaintext space  $p^{e-e'+r}$ .

**The decryption procedure itself.** When we want to decrypt a mod- $p^r$  ciphertext  $\mathbf{ct}$  relative to the “standard” key  $\mathbf{sk}$ , we first key-switch it to  $\tilde{\mathbf{sk}}$  and modulus-switch it to  $\tilde{q} = p^e + 1$ , then make its coefficients divisible by  $p^{e'}$  using the procedure from Lemma 5.2, thus getting a new ciphertext  $\mathbf{ct}' = (\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1)$ . We then compute the homomorphic inner-product divided by  $p^{e'}$ , by setting  $\mathbf{ct}'' = (\mathbf{c}'_1/p^{e'}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{ct}} + (0, \mathbf{c}'_0/p^{e'})$ .

Next we apply the first linear transformation (the map  $\mathbf{Eval}^{-1}$  from Section 4.2), moving to the slots the coefficients of the plaintext  $\mathbf{u}'$  that is encrypted in  $\mathbf{ct}''$ . The result is a single ciphertext with *fully packed slots*, where each slot holds  $d$  of the coefficients from  $\mathbf{u}'$ . Before we can apply the digit-extraction procedure from Section 5.3, we therefore need to *unpack* the slots, so as to put each coefficient in its own slot, which results in  $d$  “sparsely packed” ciphertexts (as described in Section 4.3).

Next we apply the digit-extraction procedure from Section 5.3 to each one of these  $d$  “sparsely packed” ciphertexts. For each one we extract the digits up to  $e+r-e'$  (or up to  $e+r-e'-1$  if  $p=2$  and  $r>2$ ), and combine the top digits as per Lemma 5.1 to get in the slots the coefficients of the plaintext polynomial  $\mathbf{m}$  (one coefficient per slot). The resulting ciphertexts all have plaintext space mod- $p^r$ .

Next we re-combine the  $d$  ciphertext into a single fully-packed ciphertext (as described in Section 4.3) and finally apply the second linear transformation (the map  $\mathbf{Eval}$  described in Section 4.2). This completes the decryption procedure.

## 6 Implementation and Performance

As discussed in Section 4.2, our algorithms for the linear transformations rely on the parameter  $m$  having a fairly special form. Luckily, there are quite a few such  $m$ 's, which we found by brute-force search. We ran a simple program that searches through a range of possible  $m$ 's (odd, not divisible

by  $p$ , and not prime). For each such  $m$ , we first compute the order  $d$  of  $p \bmod m$ . If this exceeds a threshold (we chose a threshold of 100), we skip this  $m$ . Next, we compute the factorization of  $m$  into prime powers as  $m = m_1 \cdots m_t$ . We then find all indexes  $i$  such that  $p$  has order  $d \bmod m_i$  and all pairs of indexes  $i, j$  such that  $p$  has order  $d \bmod m_i m_j$ . If we find none, we skip this  $m$ ; otherwise, we choose one such index, or pair of indexes, in such a way to balance the time and depth complexity of the linear transformations (so  $m_i$  or  $m_i m_j$  becomes the new  $m_1$ , and the other prime power factors are ordered arbitrarily).

cyclotomic ring $m$	21845 =257·5·17	18631 =601·31	28679 =241·17·7	35113 =(73·13)·37
lattice dim. $\phi(m)$	16384	18000	23040	31104
plaintext space	$\text{GF}(2^{16})$	$\text{GF}(2^{25})$	$\text{GF}(2^{24})$	$\text{GF}(2^{36})$
number of slots	1024	720	960	864
security level	76	110	96	159
before/after levels	22/10	20/10	24/11	24/12
initialization (sec)	177	248	224	694
linear transforms (sec)	127	131	123	325
digit extraction (sec)	193	293	342	1206
<b>total decrypt (sec)</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>1531</b>
space usage (GB)	3.4	3.5	3.5	8.2

Table 1: Experimental results with plaintext space  $\text{GF}(2^d)$

cyclotomic ring $m$	45551 =(41·11)·101	51319 =(19·73)·37	42799 = 337·127	49981 =331·151
lattice dim. $\phi(m)$	40000	46656	42336	49981
plaintext space	$\text{GF}(17^{40})$	$\text{GF}(127^{36})$	$R(256, 21)$	$R(256, 30)$
number of slots	1000	1296	2016	1650
security level	106	161	79	91
before/after levels	38/10	32/11	52/6	56/10
initialization (sec)	1148	2787	1202	1533
linear transforms (sec)	735	774	2265	2834
digit extraction (sec)	3135	1861	8542	14616
<b>total decrypt (sec)</b>	<b>3870</b>	<b>2635</b>	<b>10807</b>	<b>17448</b>
space usage (GB)	14.8	39.9	15.6	21.6

Table 2: Experimental results with other plaintext spaces

For example, with  $p = 2$ , we processed all potential  $m$ 's between 16,000 and 64,000. Among these, there were a total of 377 useful  $m$ 's with  $15,000 \leq \phi(m) \leq 60,016$ , with a fairly even spread (the largest gap between successive  $\phi(m)$ 's was less than 2,500, and there were no other gaps that exceeded 2,000). So while such useful  $m$ 's are relatively rare, there are still plenty to choose from. We ran this parameter-generation program to find potential settings for plaintext-space modulo  $p = 2, p = 17, p = 127$ , and  $p^r = 2^8$ , and manually chose a few of the suggested values of  $m$  for our tests.

For each of these values of  $m, p, r$ , we then ran a test in which we chose three random keys, and performed decryption three times per key (for each key decrypting the same ciphertext over and over). These tests were run on a five-year-old IBM BladeCenter HS22/7870, with two Intel X5570 (4-core) processors, running at 2.93GHz. All of our programs are single-threaded, so only one core was used in the computations. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the results from our experiments.

In each table, the first row gives  $m$  and its factorization into prime powers. The first factor (or pair of factors, if grouped by parentheses) shows the value that was used in the role of  $m_1$  (as in Section 4.2). The second row gives  $\phi(m)$ . The third row gives the plaintext space, i.e., the field/ring that is embedded in each slot (here,  $R(p^r, d)$  means a ring extension of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ ). The fourth row gives the number of slots packed into a single ciphertext. The fifth row gives the effective security level, computed using the formula that is used in **HElib**, taken from [15, Eqn.(8)]. The sixth row gives the levels of ciphertext just before reryption (i.e., the ciphertext which is included in the public key) and just after the end of the reryption procedure. The difference accounts for the depth of reryption, and the after-levels is roughly the circuit-depth that an application can compute on the resulting ciphertext before having to reencrypt again. We tried to target 10 remaining levels, to allow nontrivial processing between reryptions.

The remaining rows show the resources used in performing a reryption. The timing results reflect the average of the 9 runs for each setting, and the memory usage is the top usage among all these runs. Row 7 gives a one-time initialization cost (all times in seconds). Row 10 (in boldface) gives the total time for a single reryption, while the previous two rows give a breakdown of that time (note that the time for the linear transforms includes some trivial preprocessing time, as well as the less trivial unpacking/repacking time). The last row gives the memory used (in gigabytes).

## 7 Future work

Eventually, we would like to enhance our implementations to take advantage of multicore computing environments. There are at least two levels at which the implementation could be easily parallelized. At a low level, the conversions between DoubleCRT and polynomial representation in **HElib** could be easily parallelized, as the FFT's for the different primes can be done in parallel (as already observed in [27]). Our bootstrapping procedure could also be parallelized at a higher level: the rotations in each stage of the linear transformation step can be done in parallel, as can the  $d$  different digit extraction steps. Doing the parallel steps at a higher level could possibly yield a better work/overhead ratio, but this would have to be confirmed experimentally.

Another direction to explore is the possibility of speeding up the digit extraction procedure in the special case where the values in the ciphertext slots are constants in the base ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$  (or, more generally, lie in some sub-ring of the ring  $E$  contained in each slot). Right now, our bootstrapping algorithm does not exploit this: even in this special case, our digit extraction algorithm still has to be applied to  $d$  ciphertexts. In principle, we should be able to reduce the number of applications of the digit extraction significantly (from  $d$  to 1, if the values in the slots are constants); however, it is not clear how to do this while maintaining the structure (and therefore efficiency) of the linear transformations.

Another direction to explore is to try to find a better way to represent constants. In **HElib**, the most compact way to store constants in  $R_{p^r}$  is also the most natural: as coefficient vectors of polynomials over  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ . However, in this representation, a surprisingly significant amount of time may be spent in homomorphic computations converting these constants to DoubleCRT format. One could precompute and store these DoubleCRT representations, but this can be quite wasteful of space, as DoubleCRT's occupy much more space than the corresponding polynomials over  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ . We may state as an open question: is there a more compact representation of elements of  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}[X]$  that can be converted to DoubleCRT format in linear time?

## References

- [1] J. Alperin-Sheriff and C. Peikert. Practical bootstrapping in quasilinear time. In R. Canetti and J. A. Garay, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO'13*, volume 8042 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–20. Springer, 2013.
- [2] J. Alperin-Sheriff and C. Peikert. Faster bootstrapping with polynomial error. In J. A. Garay and R. Gennaro, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2014, Part I*, pages 297–314. Springer, 2014.
- [3] Z. Brakerski. Fully homomorphic encryption without modulus switching from classical gapsvp. In R. Safavi-Naini and R. Canetti, editors, *CRYPTO*, volume 7417 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 868–886. Springer, 2012.
- [4] Z. Brakerski, C. Gentry, and V. Vaikuntanathan. (leveled) fully homomorphic encryption without bootstrapping. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 6(3):13, 2014.
- [5] Z. Brakerski and V. Vaikuntanathan. Lattice-based FHE as secure as PKE. In M. Naor, editor, *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS'14*, pages 1–12. ACM, 2014.
- [6] J. H. Cheon, J. Coron, J. Kim, M. S. Lee, T. Lepoint, M. Tibouchi, and A. Yun. Batch fully homomorphic encryption over the integers. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2013, 32nd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Athens, Greece, May 26-30, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 315–335, 2013.
- [7] J. Coron, T. Lepoint, and M. Tibouchi. Batch fully homomorphic encryption over the integers. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2013:36, 2013.
- [8] J. Coron, D. Naccache, and M. Tibouchi. Public key compression and modulus switching for fully homomorphic encryption over the integers. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2012 - 31st Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Cambridge, UK, April 15-19, 2012. Proceedings*, pages 446–464, 2012.
- [9] M. van Dijk, C. Gentry, S. Halevi, and V. Vaikuntanathan. Fully homomorphic encryption over the integers. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2010, 29th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, French Riviera, May 30 - June 3, 2010. Proceedings*, pages 24–43, 2010.
- [10] L. Ducas and D. Micciancio. FHE Bootstrapping in less than a second. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2014/816, 2014. <http://eprint.iacr.org/>.
- [11] C. Gentry. Fully homomorphic encryption using ideal lattices. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing - STOC 2009*, pages 169–178. ACM, 2009.
- [12] C. Gentry and S. Halevi. Implementing gentry’s fully-homomorphic encryption scheme. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT'11*, volume 6632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 129–148. Springer, 2011.
- [13] C. Gentry, S. Halevi, C. Peikert, and N. P. Smart. Field switching in BGV-style homomorphic encryption. *Journal of Computer Security*, 21(5):663–684, 2013.
- [14] C. Gentry, S. Halevi, and N. Smart. Fully homomorphic encryption with polylog overhead. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2012*, volume 7237 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 465–482. Springer, 2012. Full version at <http://eprint.iacr.org/2011/566>.

- [15] C. Gentry, S. Halevi, and N. Smart. Homomorphic evaluation of the AES circuit. In *"Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2012"*, volume 7417 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 850–867. Springer, 2012. Full version at <http://eprint.iacr.org/2012/099>.
- [16] C. Gentry, S. Halevi, and N. P. Smart. Better bootstrapping in fully homomorphic encryption. In *Public Key Cryptography - PKC 2012*, volume 7293 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–16. Springer, 2012.
- [17] C. Gentry, A. Sahai, and B. Waters. Homomorphic encryption from learning with errors: Conceptually-simpler, asymptotically-faster, attribute-based. In R. Canetti and J. A. Garay, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2013, Part I*, pages 75–92. Springer, 2013.
- [18] S. Halevi and V. Shoup. Algorithms in HELib. In J. A. Garay and R. Gennaro, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2014, Part I*, pages 554–571. Springer, 2014. Long version at <http://eprint.iacr.org/2014/106>.
- [19] S. Halevi and V. Shoup. HELib - An Implementation of homomorphic encryption. <https://github.com/shaih/HELlib/>, Accessed September 2014.
- [20] J. Hoffstein, J. Pipher, and J. H. Silverman. NTRU: A ring-based public key cryptosystem. In J. Buhler, editor, *ANTS*, volume 1423 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 267–288. Springer, 1998.
- [21] A. López-Alt, E. Tromer, and V. Vaikuntanathan. On-the-fly multiparty computation on the cloud via multikey fully homomorphic encryption. In *STOC*, pages 1219–1234, 2012.
- [22] V. Lyubashevsky, C. Peikert, and O. Regev. "a toolkit for ring-LWE cryptography". In T. Johansson and P. Q. Nguyen, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2013*, pages 35–54. Springer, 2013.
- [23] V. Lyubashevsky, C. Peikert, and O. Regev. On ideal lattices and learning with errors over rings. *J. ACM*, 60(6):43, 2013. Early version in EUROCRYPT 2010.
- [24] E. Orsini, J. van de Pol, and N. P. Smart. Bootstrapping BGV ciphertexts with a wider choice of p and q. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2014/408, 2014. <http://eprint.iacr.org/>.
- [25] O. Regev. On lattices, learning with errors, random linear codes, and cryptography. *J. ACM*, 56(6), 2009.
- [26] R. Rivest, L. Adleman, and M. Dertouzos. On data banks and privacy homomorphisms. In *Foundations of Secure Computation*, pages 169–177. Academic Press, 1978.
- [27] K. Rohloff and D. B. Cousins. A scalable implementation of fully homomorphic encryption built on NTRU. 2nd Workshop on Applied Homomorphic Cryptography and Encrypted Computing, WAHC'14, 2014. Available at [https://www.dcsec.uni-hannover.de/fileadmin/ful/mitarbeiter/brenner/wahc14\\_RC.pdf](https://www.dcsec.uni-hannover.de/fileadmin/ful/mitarbeiter/brenner/wahc14_RC.pdf), accessed September 2014.
- [28] S. Roman. *Field Theory*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2005.
- [29] N. P. Smart and F. Vercauteren. Fully homomorphic SIMD operations. *Des. Codes Cryptography*, 71(1):57–81, 2014. Early verion at <http://eprint.iacr.org/2011/133>.



## A Parameters for Digit Extraction

Here we explain our choice of parameters for the decryption procedure ( $e, e', \alpha$ , etc.). These parameters depend on the cyclotomic ring  $R_m$ , plaintext space  $p^r$ , and the  $l_1$ -norm of the decryption secret key  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{k}$  (which we denote  $t$ ).

We begin the decryption procedure with a noise- $n$  ciphertext  $(\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1)$ , relative to plaintext space  $p^r$ , a secret key  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{k} = (1, \tilde{\mathbf{s}})$  with  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq t$ , and modulus  $\tilde{q} = p^e + 1$ . This means that for the element  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow \langle \tilde{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{ct} \rangle$  (without modular reduction) we have  $\|[\mathbf{u}]_q\|_\infty < n$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty < (t+1)q/2$ , and that the plaintext element encrypted in  $\mathbf{ct}$  is  $m \leftarrow [[\mathbf{u}]_q]_{p^r}$ .<sup>7</sup> We then make the coefficients of  $\mathbf{ct}$  divisible by  $p^{e'}$  using Lemma 5.2, thus getting another ciphertext

$$\mathbf{ct}' = (\mathbf{c}'_0, \mathbf{c}'_1) = (\mathbf{c}_0 + p^r \mathbf{u}_0 + q \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{c}_1 + p^r \mathbf{u}_1 + q \mathbf{v}_1).$$

Consider the effect of this modification on the coefficients of  $\mathbf{u}' \leftarrow \langle \tilde{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{ct}' \rangle = \mathbf{c}'_0 + \tilde{\mathbf{s}} \cdot \mathbf{c}'_1$ . Clearly we have increased both the noise (due to the added  $p^r$  terms) and the magnitude of the coefficients (mostly due to the added  $q$  terms). Specifically, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}'\| &\leq \|\mathbf{u}\| + (\|\mathbf{u}_0\| + t\|\mathbf{u}_1\|)p^r + (\|\mathbf{v}_0\| + t\|\mathbf{v}_1\|)q \\ &\leq (t+1) \underbrace{\left( \frac{q}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha p^{r+e'-1}}{2} \right\rfloor \right)}_{< q} + qp^r \left( \frac{1}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{(1-\alpha)p^{e'-1}}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &\leq (t+1)q(1 + (1-\alpha)p^{r+e'-1}/2 + p^r/2), \\ \|[\mathbf{u}']_q\| &\leq \|[\mathbf{u}]_q\| + (\|\mathbf{u}_0\| + t\|\mathbf{u}_1\|)p^r \leq n + (t+1)\lceil \alpha p^{r+e'-1}/2 \rceil \leq n + (t+1)(1 + \alpha p^{r+e'-1}/2). \end{aligned}$$

To be able to still use Lemma 5.1 we need to have  $\|[\mathbf{u}']_q\| < q/4$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}'\| < q^2/4 - q$ . Namely we need both

$$n + (t+1)(1 + \alpha p^{r+e'-1}/2) < q/4 \quad \text{and} \quad (t+1)(1 + (1-\alpha)p^{r+e'-1}/2 + p^r/2) < q/4 - 1,$$

or in other words

$$q/4 \geq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (t+1)(1 + \frac{\alpha p^{r+e'-1}}{2}) + n, \\ (t+1)(1 + \frac{(1-\alpha)p^{r+e'-1}}{2}) + \frac{(t+1)p^r}{2} + 1 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

To get good parameters we would like to set  $\alpha, e'$  such that these two constraints are roughly equivalent. Ignoring for simplicity the  $+1$  at the end of the bottom constraint, we would want to set the parameters so that

$$(t+1)(1 + \frac{\alpha p^{r+e'-1}}{2}) + n = (t+1)(1 + \frac{(1-\alpha)p^{r+e'-1}}{2}) + \frac{(t+1)p^r}{2} \Leftrightarrow \alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n - (t+1)p^r/2}{(t+1)p^{r+e'-1}}.$$

Note that with our parameters the noise  $n$  is much larger than  $(t+1)p^r/2$ : The noise after modulus-switching is at least as large as the modulus-switching added factor (cf. [4, Lemma 4]), and the heuristic estimate for that added factor (taken from the **HElib** design document) is  $p^r \cdot \sqrt{(t+1)\phi(m)/12}$ . Since we use Hamming weight  $t \ll \phi(m)$  for the secret key  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ , then  $\sqrt{(t+1)\phi(m)} \gg (t+1)$ , which means that  $n \approx p^r \cdot \sqrt{(t+1)\phi(m)} \gg p^r \cdot (t+1)$ . Hence to get good parameters we need  $\alpha \approx \frac{1}{2} - n/((t+1)p^{r+e'-1})$ , and since we can only use  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  then it means that we need to set  $e'$  large enough in order to get  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\alpha$  tends to  $1/2$  as  $e'$  grows.

<sup>7</sup>The term  $(t+1)q/2$  assumes no “ring constant”, i.e.  $\|\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{c}_1\| \leq \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{c}_1\|$ . This is not always true but it makes a reasonable heuristic, and we use it for most of this section.

$m$	$p^r$	$e$	$e'$	$\alpha$	$t$	$B$	$c_m$	Comments
21854	2	15	9	0.45311	56	23	16.0	
18631	2	15	9	0.45291	56	23	0.5	
28679	2	15	9	0.45241	56	23	10.0	
35115	2	13	6	0	59	25	4.0	“conservative” flag
45551	17	4	2	0	134	25	20.0	
51319	127	3	2	0	56	25	2.0	forced $t = 56$
42799	$2^8$	23	10	0.45149	57	25	0.2	frequent mod-switching
49981	$2^8$	23	10	0.45125	57	25	1.0	frequent mod-switching

Table 3: Parameters in our different tests.  $B$  is the width (in bits) of levels in the modulus-chain, and  $c_m$  is the experimental “ring constant” that we used.

To get a first estimate, we assume that we have  $e, e'$  large enough to get  $\alpha \approx 1/2$ , and we analyze how large must we make  $e - e'$ . With  $\alpha \approx 1/2$  and the two terms in Eqn. (8) roughly equal, we can simplify that equation to get

$$q/4 = (p^e + 1)/4 > (t + 1)\left(1 + \frac{p^{r+e'-1}}{4} + \frac{p^r}{2}\right) + 1.$$

With  $e' \gg 1$  the most significant term on the right-hand side is  $(t + 1)p^{r+e'-1}/4$ , so we can simplify further to get  $p^e/4 > (t + 1 + \epsilon)p^{r+e'-1}/4$  (with  $\epsilon$  a small quantity that captures all the low-order terms), or  $e - e' > r - 1 + \log_p(t + 1 + \epsilon)$ . In our implementation we therefore try to use the setting  $e - e' = r - 1 + \lceil \log_p(t + 2) \rceil$ , and failing that we use  $e - e' = r + \lceil \log_p(t + 2) \rceil$ .

In more detail, on input  $m, p, r$  we set an initial value of  $t = 56$ , then set  $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (t + 1)/p^{\lceil \log_p(t+2) \rceil}$ . Plugging  $e - e' = r - 1 + \lceil \log_p(t + 2) \rceil$  in Eqn. (8) and ignoring some ‘+1’ terms, we get

$$p^e > \max \left\{ \frac{4(t + n)}{1 - 2\alpha\gamma}, \frac{2(t + 1)p^r}{1 - 2(1 - \alpha)\gamma} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

For the noise  $n$  we substitute twice the modulus-switching added noise term,  $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^r \sqrt{(t + 1)\phi(m)/3}$ , and then we solve for the value  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  that minimizes the right-hand side of Eqn. (9). This gives us a lower-bound on  $p^e$ .

Next we check that this lower-bound is not too big: recall that at the beginning of the decryption process we multiply the ciphertext  $\tilde{ct}$  from the public key by the “constant”  $\mathbf{c}'_1/p^{e'}$ , whose entries can be as large as  $q^2/(4p^{e'}) \approx p^{2e-e'-2}$ . Hence as we increase  $e$  we need to multiply by a larger constant, and the noise grows accordingly. In the implementation we define “too big” (somewhat arbitrarily) to be anything more than half the ratio between two successive moduli in our chain. If  $p^e$  is “too big” then we reset  $e - e'$  to be one larger, which means re-solving the same system but this time using  $\gamma' = \gamma/p$  instead of  $\gamma$ .

Once we computed the values  $e, e', \alpha$ , we finally check if it is possible to increase our initial  $t = 56$  (i.e., the decryption key weight) without violating Eqn. (9). This gives us the final values for all of our constants. We summarize the parameters that we used in our tests in Table 3.

**Caveats.** The BGV implementation in `HElib` relies on a myriad of parameters, some of which are heuristically chosen, and so it takes some experimentation to set them all so as to get a working implementation with good performance. Some of the adjustments that we made in the course of our testing include the following:

- **HElib** relies on a heuristic noise estimate in order to decide when to perform modulus-switching. One inaccuracy of that estimate is that it assumes that  $\|xy\| \leq \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$ , which does not quite hold for the bases that are used in **HElib** for representing elements in the ring  $R = \mathbb{Z}[X]/(\Phi_m(X))$ . To compensate, the library contains a “ring constant”  $c_m$  which is set by default to 1 but can be adjusted by the calling application, and then it sets  $\text{estimate}(\|xy\|) := \text{estimate}(\|x\|) \cdot \text{estimate}(\|y\|) \cdot c_m$ . In our tests we often had to set that constant to a larger value to get accurate noise estimation — we set the value experimentally so as to get good estimate for the noise at the output of the decryption procedure.
- The same “ring constant” might also affect the setting of the parameters  $e, e', \alpha$  from above. Rather than trying to incorporate it into the calculation, our implementation just provides a flag that forces us to forgo the more aggressive setting of  $e - e' = r - 1 + \lceil \log_p(t + 2) \rceil$ , and instead always use the more conservative  $e - e' = r + \lceil \log_p(t + 2) \rceil$ . The effect is that we have to extract one more digit during the digit extraction part, but it ensures that we do not get decryption errors from the use of our simplified decryption formula. In our tests we had to use this “conservative” flag for the tests at  $m = 35113$ .
- Also, we sometimes had to manually set the Hamming weight of the decryption key to a lower value than what our automatic procedure suggests, to avoid decryption errors. This happened for the setting  $p = 127, m = 51319$ , where the automated procedure suggested to use  $t = 59$  but we had to revert back to  $t = 56$  to avoid errors.
- The “width” of each level (i.e., the ratio  $q_{i+1}/q_i$  in the modulus chain) can be adjusted in **HElib**. The trade-off is that wider levels give better noise reduction, but also larger overall moduli (and hence lower levels of security). The **HElib** implementation uses by default 23 bits per level, which seems to work well for values of  $m < 30000$  and  $p^r = 2$ . For our tests, however, this was sometime not enough, and we had to increase it to 25 bits per level.

For the tests with plaintext space modulo  $2^8$ , even 25 bits per level were not quite enough. However for various low-level reasons (having to do with the NTL single-precision bounds), setting the bit length to 26 bits or more is not a good option. Instead we changed some of the internals of **HElib**, making it use modulus-switching a little more often than its default setting, while keeping the level width at 25 bits. As a result, for that setting we used many more levels than for all the other settings (an average of 1.5 levels per squaring).

## B Why We Didn’t Use Ring Switching

One difference between our implementation and the procedure described by Alperin-Sheriff and Peikert [1] is that we do not use the ring-switching techniques of Gentry et al. [13] to implement the tensor decomposition of our Eval transformation and its inverse. There are several reasons why we believe that an implementation based on ring switching is less appealing in our context, especially for the smaller parameter settings (say,  $\phi(m) < 30000$ ). The reasoning behind this is as follows:

**Rough factorization of  $m$ .** Since the non-linear part of our decryption procedure takes at least seven levels, and we target having around 10 levels left at the end of decryption, it means that for our smaller examples we cannot afford to spend too many levels for the linear transformations. Since every stage of the linear transformation consumes at least half a level,<sup>8</sup> then for such small parameters we need very few stages. In other words, we have to consider fairly coarse-grained factorization of  $m$ , where the factors have sizes  $m^\epsilon$  for a significant  $\epsilon$  (as large as  $\sqrt{m}$  in some cases).

---

<sup>8</sup>Whether or not we use ring-switching, each stage of the linear transformation has depth of at least one multiply-by-constant, which consumes at least half a level in terms of added noise.

**Using large rings.** Recall that the first linear transformation during decryption begins with the fresh ciphertext in the public key (after multiplying by a constant). That ciphertext has very low noise, so we have to process it in a large ring to ensure security.<sup>9</sup> This means that we must *switch up* to a much larger ring before we can afford to drop these rough factors of  $m$ . Hence we will be spending most of our time on operations in very large rings, which defeats the purpose of targeting these smaller sub-30000 rings in the first place.

We also note that in our tests, the decryption time is dominated by the non-linear part, so our implementation seems close to optimal there. It is plausible that some gains can be made by using ring switching for the second linear transformation, after the non-linear part, but we did not explore this option in our implementation. And as we said above, there is not much to be gained by optimizing the linear transformations.

---

<sup>9</sup>More specifically, the key-switching matrices that allow us to process it must be defined in a large ring.