

## TLDR

: We present a data custody scheme based on bitwise XOR. It is a simplification of the [Merkleisation-based custody scheme](#) and drastically improves its challenge communication complexity. That is, the worst-case number of challenge-response rounds as well as the worst-case data overhead is significantly reduced.

### Construction

Let  $s$

be a 32-byte secret and  $D$

an  $n$

-bit piece of data. We define helper functions:

- Let  $\text{chunkify}(D, k)$

be the ordered list of  $k$

equally-sized chunks of  $D$

.

- Let  $M$

be the “mix” of  $D$

with  $s$

, i.e. the concatenation of  $\text{hash}(\text{xor}(c, s))$

for every chunk  $c$

in  $\text{chunkify}(D, \text{len}(D)/32)$

.

- Let  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(D)$

to be the XOR of every bit of  $D$

.

A prover wanting to prove custody of  $D$

prepares the mix  $M$

, commits to the custody bit  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(M)$

and the secret  $s$

, and later reveals  $s$

.

A challenger that disagrees on the custody bit issues a  $k$

-bit challenge where the  $i$

th bit is  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(\text{chunkify}(M, k)[i])$

. The prover must then disagree with the challenger on some  $i_0$

th bit with corresponding chunk  $M_0 = \text{chunkify}(M, k)[i_0]$

. The prover then responds with  $i_0$

alongside a  $k$

-bit response where the  $i$

th bit is  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(\text{chunkify}(M_0, k)[i])$

. The challenger must then disagree with the prover on some  $i_1$

th bit with corresponding chunk  $M_1 = \text{chunkify}(M_0, k)[i_1]$

. The game continues until either the prover or challenger responds with a  $k$

-bit chunk of  $M$

alongside a Merkle proof.

Illustration

In the context of Ethereum 2.0 sharding (phase 1), assume that  $\text{SHARD\_BLOCK\_SIZE} = 2^{15}$

bytes and that  $\text{SLOTS\_PER\_EPOCH} = 2^6$

slots. A validator wanting to prove custody of shard blocks over an epoch prepares a mix  $M$

with size  $n = 2^{24}$

bits (2MB). We illustrate the challenge game with two different values of  $k$

.

When  $k = 2^{12}$

, the mix  $M$

is split into  $k$

chunks, each of size  $k$

bits. If the challenger disagrees with  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(M)$

it shares  $\text{bitwise\_xor}$

for every chunk of  $M$

. The validator must disagree on  $\text{bitwise\_xor}$

for some  $i_0$

th chunk. It then responds with  $i_0$

, the corresponding chunk  $M_0$

, and a Merkle proof for  $M_0$

. The round complexity is 1 (two half rounds), and the total communication overhead is 1378 bytes:

- $k$

bits for the challenge (512 bytes)

- $\log(k)$

bits for  $i_0$

(2 bytes)

- $k$

bits for  $M_0$

(512 bytes)

- $\log(k) - 1$

hashes for the Merkle path of  $M_0$

(352 bytes)

When  $k = 2^8$

, the mix  $M$

is split into  $k^2$

chunks, each of size  $k$

bits. If the challenger disagrees with  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(M)$

it shares  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(\text{chunkify}(M, k)[i])$

for every  $0 \leq i < k$

. The validator must disagree on some  $M_0 = \text{chunkify}(M, k)[i_0]$

, and shares  $i_0$

and  $\text{bitwise\_xor}(\text{chunkify}(M_0, k)[i])$

for every  $0 \leq i < k$

. The challenger must disagree on some  $M_1 = \text{chunkify}(M_0, k)[i_1]$

which happens to be a chunk of  $M$

. It then responds with  $i_1$

,  $M_1$

, and a Merkle proof for  $M_1$

. The round complexity is 1.5 (three half rounds), and the total communication overhead is 578 bytes:

- $k$

bits for the initial challenge (32 bytes)

- $\log(k)$

bits for  $i_0$

(1 byte)

- $k$

bits for  $M_0$

(32 bytes)

- $\log(k)$

bits for  $i_1$

(1 byte)

- $k$

bits for  $M_1$

(32 bytes)

- $2 \cdot \log(k) - 1$

hashes for the Merkle path of  $M_1$

(480 bytes)