

IPA as sumcheck

Ariel Gabizon (based on work with Liam Eagen)

Aztec Labs

Main Goal:

- ▶ Reduce linear verifier time from IPA

Polynomials over \mathbb{G}

Multilinears and vectors

$$n = 2^k.$$

$$\mathbf{f} = (f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^n, z \in \mathbb{F}^k$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}(z) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \ll \mathbf{n}} \text{eq}(\mathbf{i}, z) \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{i}}$$

Multilinears and vectors

$$n = 2^k.$$

$$\mathbf{f} = (f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^n, z \in \mathbb{F}^k$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}(z) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \ll \mathbf{n}} \text{eq}(\mathbf{i}, z) f_{\mathbf{i}}$$

(can do same for $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}^n$)

MLPCS based on IPA:

Setup: Choose random non-zero

$$\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_0, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{G}^n, \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{G}.$$

MLPCS based on IPA:

Setup: Choose random non-zero

$$\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_0, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{G}^n, \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{G}.$$

Commitment: $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \sum_{i < n} f_i \mathbf{G}_i$.

MLPCS based on IPA:

Setup: Choose random non-zero

$$\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{G}_0, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{G}^n, \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{G}.$$

Commitment: $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} f_i \mathbf{G}_i$.

Openings: next slide.

Given $\mathbf{cm} \in \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^k, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$ want to prove $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{cm}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{v}$.

Given $\mathbf{cm} \in \mathbb{G}$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^k$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$ want to prove $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{cm}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{v}$.

Define the polynomial

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) := \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{P}$$

Given $\mathbf{cm} \in \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^k, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$ want to prove $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{cm}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{v}$.

Define the polynomial

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) := \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{P}$$

When claim holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k} \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{b})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{b})\mathbf{P} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} < \mathbf{n}} \mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{G}_i + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{z})\mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{cm} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z})\mathbf{P} \end{aligned}$$

Given $\mathbf{cm} \in \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^k, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$ want to prove $\mathbf{com}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{cm}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{v}$.

Define the polynomial

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) := \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{P}$$

When claim holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k} \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{b})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{b})\mathbf{P} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} < \mathbf{n}} \mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{G}_i + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{z})\mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{cm} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z})\mathbf{P} \end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} will run sumcheck on \mathbf{A} with target value $\mathbf{cm} + \mathbf{vP}$.

\mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} will run sumcheck on \mathbf{A} with target value $\mathbf{cm} + \mathbf{vP}$.

At end of sumcheck, \mathcal{V} needs to evaluate $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{P}$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{F}^k$.

\mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} will run sumcheck on \mathbf{A} with target value $\mathbf{cm} + \mathbf{vP}$.

At end of sumcheck, \mathcal{V} needs to evaluate $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{P}$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{F}^k$.

In IPA: \mathcal{V} computes $\mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z}), \hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$. \mathcal{P} *simply sends* $\mathbf{a} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})$.

\mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} will run sumcheck on \mathbf{A} with target value $\mathbf{cm} + \mathbf{vP}$.

At end of sumcheck, \mathcal{V} needs to evaluate $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{P}$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{F}^k$.

In IPA: \mathcal{V} computes $\mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z}), \hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$. \mathcal{P} simply sends $\mathbf{a} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})$.

The strange (and useful) thing: When \mathbb{G} has hard discrete-log this is sound!

\mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} will run sumcheck on \mathbf{A} with target value $\mathbf{cm} + \mathbf{vP}$.

At end of sumcheck, \mathcal{V} needs to evaluate $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z})\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{P}$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{F}^k$.

In IPA: \mathcal{V} computes $\mathbf{eq}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z}), \hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$. \mathcal{P} simply sends $\mathbf{a} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r})$.

The strange (and useful) thing: When \mathbb{G} has hard discrete-log this is sound!

Drawback: Computing $\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$ is n -size MSM for \mathcal{V} !

Mitigation from Halo: defer MSM

Note

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{n}} \text{eq}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{i}},$$

is the *commitment to* $\text{eq}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r})!$

Mitigation from Halo: defer MSM

Note

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{n}} \text{eq}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{i}},$$

is the *commitment to* $\text{eq}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r})$!

Can use this to reduce multiple evaluation claims

$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}$ into one.

\mathcal{P} proving correctness of $\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$

Observation: If we have mlPCS for field-valued multilinear, where all ops on \mathbf{f} 's vals are \mathbb{F} -linear, can also use on group valued multilinear \mathbf{G} . - e.g. Basefold

Correlated agreement theorem: