

# Formal Verification of Arithmetic Circuits

Marcin Kostrzewa



# Real bugs in ZK protocols

Under-constrained Circuits

Nondeterministic Circuits

Arithmetic Over/Under Flows

Mismatching Bit Lengths

Unused Public Inputs Optimized Out

Frozen Heart: Forging of Zero Knowledge Proofs

Trusted Setup Leak

Assigned but not Constrained

*source: <https://github.com/0xPARC/zk-bug-tracker>*

# Real bugs in ZK protocols

Under-constrained Circuits

Nondeterministic Circuits

Arithmetic Over/Under Flows

Mismatching Bit Lengths

Unused Public Inputs Optimized Out

Frozen Heart: Forging of Zero Knowledge Proofs

Trusted Setup Leak

Assigned but not Constrained

*source: <https://github.com/0xPARC/zk-bug-tracker>*

**17 out of 26 listed  
bugs are circuit  
issues**

# The most powerful design principle

# The most powerful design principle

Producing values out of thin air, then constraining them.

# The most powerful design principle

**Producing values out of thin air, then constraining them.**

For example, to show  $N < 8$ :

1. Take  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  out of thin air

# The most powerful design principle

**Producing values out of thin air, then constraining them.**

For example, to show  $N < 8$ :

1. Take  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  out of thin air
2. Constrain:

$$x_1 * (1 - x_1) = 0$$

$$x_2 * (1 - x_2) = 0$$

$$x_3 * (1 - x_3) = 0$$

$$x_1 + 2 * x_2 + 4 * x_3 = N$$



# The most powerful design principle

**Producing values out of thin air, then constraining them.**

For example, to show  $N < 8$ :

1. Take  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  out of thin air
2. Constrain:

$$x_1 * (1 - x_1) = 0$$

$$x_2 * (1 - x_2) = 0$$

$$x_3 * (1 - x_3) = 0$$

$$x_1 + 2 * x_2 + 4 * x_3 = N$$

Even this simple example has some deep mathematical content!

# The most powerful design principle

**Producing values out of thin air, then constraining them.**

For example, to show  $N < 8$ :

1. Take  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  out of thin air

2. Constrain:

$$x_1 * (1 - x_1) = 0$$

$$x_2 * (1 - x_2) = 0$$

$$x_3 * (1 - x_3) = 0$$

$$x_1 + 2 * x_2 + 4 * x_3 = N$$

Even this simple example has some deep mathematical content!

**And doesn't work at full field bit-width.**

**If you can't avoid  
it, prove it!**

# Lean 4

# Lean 4

→ Dependently-typed functional programming language

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures
- Proofs are code



# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures
- Proofs are code
  - ↳ Maintainable

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures
- Proofs are code
  - ↳ Maintainable
  - ↳ Collaborative

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures
- Proofs are code
  - ↳ Maintainable
  - ↳ Collaborative
- Rich corpus of mathematics already implemented

# Lean 4

- Dependently-typed functional programming language
- Proof assistant
  - ↳ Can reason about programs & mathematical structures
- Proofs are code
  - ↳ Maintainable
  - ↳ Collaborative
- Rich corpus of mathematics already implemented
  - ↳ Recently completed the proof of Fermat's Last Theorem!

# Modelling circuits in Lean

# Modelling circuits in Lean

→ Use the `Prop` type to represent a constraint system.

# Modelling circuits in Lean

- Use the `Prop` type to represent a constraint system.
- Use Continuation Passing Style (CPS) for composing constraints:

```
def Constraint (α: Type): Type := (α → Prop) → Prop
```

`Constraint Foo` performs some assertions and passes a value of type `Foo` to its caller.

# Modelling circuits in Lean

→ Use existential quantification for “values out of thin air”:

```
def unconstrained (α : Type): Constraint α := fun k => ∃ a, k a
```

i.e. pass a value of the required type to the caller, without saying anything about it



# Modelling circuits in Lean

→ Use existential quantification for “values out of thin air”:

```
def unconstrained (α : Type): Constraint α := fun k => ∃ a, k a
```

i.e. pass a value of the required type to the caller, without saying anything about it

→ One more useful helper:

```
def assert (p : Prop) : Constraint Unit := fun k => p ∧ k ()
```

i.e. add a condition to the resulting proposition

# Example: binary representation

# Example: binary representation

```
def unconstrained_bit : Constraint F := fun k =>
  unconstrained F fun x =>
    assert (x * (1 - x) = 0) fun _ =>
      k x
```

# Example: binary representation

```
def unconstrained_bit : Constraint F := fun k =>
  unconstrained F fun x =>
    assert (x * (1 - x) = 0) fun _ =>
      k x
```

```
def binary_rep_3 (f : F) : Constraint (Vector F 3) := fun k =>
  unconstrained_bit fun x1 =>
  unconstrained_bit fun x2 =>
  unconstrained_bit fun x3 =>
  assert (x1 + x2 * 2 + x3 * 4 = f) fun _ =>
    k (x1 ::v x2 ::v x3 ::v Vector.nil)
```

 **Monad Alert** 

# Prettier example

```
def unconstrained_bit : Constraint F := do
  let x ← unconstrained F
  assert (x * (1 - x) = 0)
  return x
```

```
def binary_rep_3 (f : F) : Constraint (Vector F 3) := do
  let x1 ← unconstrained_bit
  let x2 ← unconstrained_bit
  let x3 ← unconstrained_bit
  assert (x1 + x2 * 2 + x3 * 4 = f)
  return x1 ::v x2 ::v x3 ::v Vector.nil
```

# Deterministic Constraints

# Deterministic Constraints

→ `def deterministic :  $\alpha \rightarrow \text{Constraint } \alpha := \text{fun } a \ k \Rightarrow k \ a$`

Embeds a known value into a constraint system.



# Deterministic Constraints

→ `def deterministic :  $\alpha \rightarrow \text{Constraint } \alpha := \text{fun } a \ k \Rightarrow k \ a$`

Embeds a known value into a constraint system.

→ Our first theorem:

`theorem binary_rep_3_deterministic:`

$\forall f, f.\text{val} < 8 \rightarrow \exists \text{rep}, \text{binary\_rep\_3 } f = \text{deterministic rep}$

For any element less than 8, we can replace the call to `binary_rep_3` with a deterministic computation.

# Deterministic Constraints

→ `def deterministic :  $\alpha \rightarrow \text{Constraint } \alpha := \text{fun } a \ k \Rightarrow k \ a$`

Embeds a known value into a constraint system.

→ Our first theorem:

`theorem binary_rep_3_deterministic:`

$\forall f, f.\text{val} < 8 \rightarrow \exists \text{ rep}, \text{binary\_rep\_3 } f = \text{deterministic rep}$

For any element less than 8, we can replace the call to `binary_rep_3` with a deterministic computation.

→ This gadget alone eliminates 3 classes of bugs: **under-constrained circuits**, **nondeterministic circuits** and **assigned but not constrained**.

# Semantic Properties

# Semantic Properties

→ We can show that our gadget actually works as a range check:

**theorem** `binary_rep_3_rangecheck`:

$\forall f\ k, \text{binary\_rep\_3 } f\ k \rightarrow f.\text{val} < 8$

# Semantic Properties of Real Protocols

# Semantic Properties of Real Protocols

**theorem** `signaller_is_in_tree`:

```
∀ (IdentityNullifier IdentityTrapdoor SignalHash ExtNullifier NullifierHash : F)
  (Tree : MerkleTree F poseidon2 20) (Path Proof: Vector F 20),
(collision_resistant poseidon2 ∧
 Semaphore.circuit IdentityNullifier IdentityTrapdoor Path Proof
   SignalHash ExtNullifier NullifierHash Tree.root) →
Tree.item_at (Dir.create_dir_vec Path.reverse) =
  identity_commitment IdentityNullifier IdentityTrapdoor
```

Correctness of the Semaphore protocol – there is no unauthorized signalling.

# Semantic Properties of Real Protocols

**theorem** no\_double\_signal\_with\_same\_commitment:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \text{ (IdentityNullifier}_1 \text{ IdentityNullifier}_2 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_1 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_2 \\ & \quad \text{SignalHash}_1 \text{ SignalHash}_2 \text{ ExtNullifier}_1 \text{ ExtNullifier}_2 \text{ NullifierHash}_1 \\ & \quad \text{NullifierHash}_2 \text{ Root}_1 \text{ Root}_2 : F) \\ & \quad (\text{Path}_1 \text{ Proof}_1 \text{ Path}_2 \text{ Proof}_2 : \text{Vector } F \text{ } 20), \\ & (\text{collision\_resistant poseidon}_2 \wedge \text{collision\_resistant poseidon}_1 \wedge \\ & \quad \text{Semaphore.circuit IdentityNullifier}_1 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_1 \text{ Path}_1 \text{ Proof}_1 \text{ SignalHash}_1 \\ & \quad \text{ExtNullifier}_1 \text{ NullifierHash}_1 \text{ Root}_1 \wedge \\ & \quad \text{Semaphore.circuit IdentityNullifier}_2 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_2 \text{ Path}_2 \text{ Proof}_2 \text{ SignalHash}_2 \\ & \quad \text{ExtNullifier}_2 \text{ NullifierHash}_2 \text{ Root}_2 \wedge \\ & \quad \text{ExtNullifier}_1 = \text{ExtNullifier}_2 \wedge \\ & \quad \text{identity\_commitment IdentityNullifier}_1 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_1 = \\ & \quad \text{identity\_commitment IdentityNullifier}_2 \text{ IdentityTrapdoor}_2) \rightarrow \\ & \quad \text{NullifierHash}_1 = \text{NullifierHash}_2 \end{aligned}$$

# Compiling to Lean

- This is all very cool, but we don't actually use Lean for circuit development.



# Compiling to Lean

- This is all very cool, but we don't actually use Lean for circuit development.
- So we've also built a compiler from Gnark to Lean.



<https://github.com/reilabs/gnark-lean-demo>

# Full workflow

# Full workflow

→ Write your circuits in Gnark

# Full workflow

- Write your circuits in Gnark
- Use our compiler to emit equivalent Lean definitions

# Full workflow

- Write your circuits in Gnark
- Use our compiler to emit equivalent Lean definitions
- Define the theorems and prove them

# Full workflow

- Write your circuits in Gnark
- Use our compiler to emit equivalent Lean definitions
- Define the theorems and prove them
- Run the verification with continuous integration to never break the circuits again!

# Results in the wild

# Results in the wild

→ Uncovered an unsoundness in Gnark's standard library



# Results in the wild

- Uncovered an unsoundness in Gnark's standard library
  - ↳ Number comparison gadget was broken – due to full-bit-width binary decompositions

# Results in the wild

- Uncovered an unsoundness in Gnark's standard library
  - ↳ Number comparison gadget was broken – due to full-bit-width binary decompositions
- Verified Worldcoin's state-management circuits - one of the most frequently used production deployments of a ZK circuit

# Further work

# Further work

→ Better support for probabilistic reasoning

# Further work

- Better support for probabilistic reasoning
  - ↳ Useful for in-circuit commitments, recursion etc.

# Further work

- Better support for probabilistic reasoning
  - ↳ Useful for in-circuit commitments, recursion etc.
- A Noir compiler!

# Thank you!



@reilabs\_io