

Game of Coding: Sybil Resistant Decentralized Machine Learning with Minimal Trust Assumption

Hanzaleh Akbari Nodehi*, Viveck R. Cadambe[†], Mohammad Ali Maddah-Ali*,
 *University of Minnesota Twin Cities, [†]The Georgia Institute of Technology

Abstract

Coding theory plays a crucial role in ensuring data integrity and reliability across various domains, from communication to computation and storage systems. However, its reliance on trust assumptions for data recovery poses significant challenges, particularly in emerging decentralized systems where trust is scarce. To address this, the *game of coding* framework was introduced, offering insights into strategies for data recovery within incentive-oriented environments. The focus of the earliest version of the game of coding was limited to scenarios involving only two nodes. This paper investigates the implications of increasing the number of nodes in the game of coding framework, particularly focusing on scenarios with one honest node and multiple adversarial nodes. We demonstrate that despite the increased flexibility for the adversary with an increasing number of adversarial nodes, having more power is not beneficial for the adversary and is not detrimental to the data collector, making this scheme sybil-resistant. Furthermore, we outline optimal strategies for the data collector in terms of accepting or rejecting the inputs, and characterize the optimal noise distribution for the adversary.

I. INTRODUCTION 1

In communication, computing, and storage systems, coding theory finds widespread application in preserving data integrity and reliability. Moreover, it has been expanded from discrete to analog domains, facilitating approximate recovery. However, whether in discrete or analog domains, coding theory heavily relies on fundamental trust assumption for data recovery. For example, consider coded computing, where a typically resource-intensive computation is distributed among N nodes. Some of these nodes are classified as honest, adhering to the protocol, while others are adversarial, deviating from the protocol arbitrarily. We denote the set of honest nodes as \mathcal{H} and the set of adversarial nodes as \mathcal{T} . With repetition coding, error-free recovery requires that $|\mathcal{H}| \geq |\mathcal{T}| + 1$. Similarly, when computation represents a Reed-Solomon (K, N) code [1], error-free recovery necessitates $|\mathcal{H}| \geq |\mathcal{T}| + K$. Likewise, employing Lagrange code [2] for a polynomial function of degree d requires $|\mathcal{H}| > |\mathcal{T}| + (K - 1)d$. In all of these scenarios, the number of honest nodes surpass the number of adversarial ones by a certain margin. Similar constraints apply in analog scenarios [3], imposing a significant and fundamental trust assumption.

On the other hand, in many new emerging and trending applications, such as decentralized systems, trust is a scarce resource [4]–[6], which restricts the application of coding theory in these contexts. An alternative trustless method to ensure the integrity and reliability is through the use of verifiable computing schemes [7]. Specifically, resource-intensive computations are outsourced to external entities. These entities perform the computations and provide the results, along with a cryptographic validity proof, which can be verified with minimal computational overhead. However, this approach has two major drawbacks: (i) the resource-intensive process of generating proofs [8]–[13] and (ii) the challenge that the most efficient verifiable computing schemes often represent computations through arithmetic circuits defined over a finite field, which may not be universally applicable [10], [14]–[16].

To address these challenges and transcend the fundamental limitations of coding theory, a new game-theoretic framework called the *game of coding* was introduced in [17]. One particularly intriguing and unique aspect of decentralized systems is their incentive-oriented environment. Specifically, contributions that are accepted are rewarded, incentivizing adversaries to ensure data recoverability by the data collector (DC) rather than killing the system’s functionality, i.e., *liveness*. Motivated by this characteristic and focusing on applications such as decentralized (blockchain-based) machine learning (DeML) and oracles, [17] considers a game where the DC and the adversary are players with utility functions to maximize. These utility functions are based on two metrics: (1) the probability of the DC accepting the inputs and (2) the error in estimating the original data if the inputs are accepted. Initially concentrating on repetition coding with two nodes, [17] outlines the equilibrium of the game. Furthermore, they ascertain the optimal strategy for the data collector in accepting or rejecting inputs, along with the optimal noise distribution for the adversary to achieve equilibrium.

However, in [17] the number of nodes is limited to 2, with one being adversarial and the other being honest. This naturally raises the question: what happens if we consider this scenario with more than 2 nodes? Specifically, in the

The work of Mohammad Ali Maddah-Ali has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant CIF-1908291. The work of Mohammad Ali Maddah-Ali and Hanzaleh Akbari Nodehi has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant CCF-2348638.

minimal trust assumption scenario, where there is only one honest node, how does increasing the number of adversarial nodes affect the utility functions of both the adversary and the DC? At first glance, it may seem that having more nodes increases the flexibility and opportunity for the adversary to maximize its utility function while decreasing the utility function of the DC.

Let's consider some examples. Suppose the estimation function of the DC is simply the median, and the DC accepts any inputs. In this case, it is evident that by increasing the number of nodes, the adversary can increase the error in estimation indefinitely, thus increasing its own utility while decreasing the utility of the DC. If we impose a condition where inputs are accepted only if the distance between any two inputs is bounded by a threshold, it implies that while the error in estimation increases with the number of adversarial nodes, it remains bounded. However, this suggests that having more nodes benefits the adversary and is detrimental to the DC. Similarly, under a rule where the distance between any two inputs is smaller than a threshold and the estimation function is the mean of inputs, it can be verified that although the error in estimation is bounded, it increases as the number of adversarial nodes increases, favoring the adversary over the DC. The objective is to devise a system, including acceptance/rejection rules and estimation functions, such that having more nodes is not advantageous for the adversary. On the other hand, another question arises: in scenarios with more nodes, what are the best strategies for the players? How does increasing the number of adversarial nodes impact these strategies?

In this paper, we explore the game of coding within the context of repetition coding, extending our analysis to scenarios where the number of nodes exceeds 2. Specifically, we consider a scenario with N nodes, operating under the minimal trust assumption where one node is assumed to be honest while the rest are adversarial. Despite initial skepticism, we demonstrate that within this framework, the adversary's utility is non-increasing as the number of adversarial nodes increases. Additionally, we prove that the minimum achievable utility for the data collector is non-decreasing as the number of adversarial nodes grows. We outline the optimal strategy for the data collector regarding input acceptance or rejection and characterize the optimal noise distribution for the adversary. Importantly, our analysis relies on minimal and natural assumptions about utility functions and the noise generated by honest players, allowing for broad applicability across various scenarios.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: In Section II, we introduce the problem setting. Additionally, Section III presents the main results and contributions of this paper. Finally, Section VI provides the detailed proofs of the theorems.

A. Notation

We use bold notation, for example, \mathbf{y} , to represent a random variable, while we don't use any bold symbol for a specific value of this random variable. For a case that a random variable \mathbf{y} follows a uniform distribution on the interval $[-u, u]$, we use the notation $\mathbf{y} \sim \text{unif}[-u, u]$, where $u \in \mathbb{R}$. The notation $[a]$ is the set of $\{1, \dots, a\}$, for $a \in \mathbb{N}$. For any countable set \mathcal{S} , we denote its size as $|\mathcal{S}|$. Each variable marked with an underline, such as \underline{z} , represents a vector. For any set \mathcal{S} and an arbitrary function $f: \mathbb{R}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the output of $\arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$ is a set comprising all elements x in \mathcal{S} that maximize $f(x)$. Similarly we define $\arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we describe the problem formulation, which is an adaptation of the problem formulation presented in [17], extending it to accommodate more than two nodes. We consider a system consisting of $N \in \mathbb{N}$ nodes and a DC. There is a random variable $\mathbf{u} \sim \text{Unif}[-M, M]$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}$. The DC aims to estimate \mathbf{u} ; however, it does not have direct access to \mathbf{u} . Instead, it relies on the set of nodes to receive information about \mathbf{u} .

The set of nodes $[N]$ is divided into two groups: honest nodes, denoted by \mathcal{H} , and adversarial nodes, denoted by \mathcal{T} , where $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq [N]$ and $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$. We operate under the minimal trust assumption, meaning that $|\mathcal{T}| = N - 1$. The subset \mathcal{T} is chosen uniformly at random from the set of all subsets of size $N - 1$ from $[N]$. Neither the DC nor the nodes in \mathcal{H} have knowledge of which nodes belong to \mathcal{T} .

An honest node $h \in \mathcal{H}$ sends \mathbf{y}_h to the DC, where

$$\mathbf{y}_h = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{n}_h, \quad h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (1)$$

and the noise \mathbf{n}_h has a symmetric probability density function (PDF), $f_{\mathbf{n}_h}$, over the bounded range $[-\Delta, \Delta]$ for some $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Specifically, $f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(-z) = f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\Pr(|\mathbf{n}_h| > \Delta) = 0$. This noise models the inaccuracy of approximate computation (e.g., sketching, randomized quantization, random projection, random sampling, etc.), where exact computation is costly. In the case of oracles, it represents that even honest nodes have access to only a noisy version of \mathbf{u} .

Each adversarial node $a \in \mathcal{T}$ sends some function, possibly randomized, of \mathbf{u} to the DC,

$$\mathbf{y}_a = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{n}_a, \quad a \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1. This figure illustrates a system with $N = 5$ nodes, where 4 of them are adversarial, shown in red. Each node's task is to output \mathbf{u} , but this process is subject to noise. Honest nodes experience noise given by \mathbf{n}_h , while adversarial nodes have noise $\{\mathbf{n}_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{T}} \sim g(\cdot)$, with $g(\cdot)$ representing an arbitrary distribution independent of \mathbf{u} , and $\mathcal{T} = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Upon receiving the data, i.e., $\mathbf{y} \triangleq (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_5)$, the DC checks whether $\max(\mathbf{y}) - \min(\mathbf{y}) \leq \eta\Delta$. If this condition is not met, the DC rejects the input; otherwise, it accepts the input and outputs $\frac{\max(\mathbf{y}) + \min(\mathbf{y})}{2}$ as its estimate.

where \mathbf{n}_a is arbitrary noise independent of \mathbf{u} , and $\{\mathbf{n}_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{T}} \sim g(\{\mathbf{n}_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{T}})$, for some joint probability density function $g(\cdot)$. The adversary selects $g(\cdot)$, and the DC is unaware of this choice. We assume that the adversary has access to the exact value¹ of \mathbf{u} . Additionally, we assume that the PDFs of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{n}_h are public and known to all, and that $\Delta \ll M$.

The DC receives $\mathbf{y} \triangleq \{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N\}$ and evaluates the results according to the following steps (See Fig. 1):

- 1) **Accept or Reject:** Define $\max(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \max \mathbf{y}_i$ and $\min(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \min \mathbf{y}_i$ for $i \in [N]$. The DC *accepts* \mathbf{y} if and only if $\max(\mathbf{y}) - \min(\mathbf{y}) \leq \eta\Delta$ for some $\eta \geq 2$. We denote by \mathcal{A}_η the event that the inputs are accepted. Additionally, we define

$$\text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) = \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g(\cdot)). \quad (3)$$

- 2) **Estimation:** If the inputs are accepted, the DC outputs $\frac{\max(\mathbf{y}) + \min(\mathbf{y})}{2}$ as its estimate of \mathbf{u} . The cost of estimation is defined as

$$\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{u} - \frac{\max(\mathbf{y}) + \min(\mathbf{y})}{2} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{A}_\eta; g(\cdot) \right], \quad (4)$$

which is the mean squared error (MSE) of the estimation, given that the inputs have been accepted.

We consider a two-player game between the DC and the adversary. Each player has a utility function they aim to maximize. The utility function of the DC is denoted as

$$\text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta) \triangleq Q_{\text{DC}}(\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta)), \quad (5)$$

where $Q_{\text{DC}} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-increasing function with respect to its first argument and a non-decreasing function with respect to its second. More specifically, for a fixed value of the second argument, $Q_{\text{DC}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is monotonically non-increasing in the first argument. Similarly, for a fixed value of the first argument, $Q_{\text{DC}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is monotonically non-decreasing in the second argument. The DC selects its strategy from the action set $\Lambda_{\text{DC}} = \{\eta \mid \eta \geq 2\}$.

The utility function of the adversary is denoted as

$$\text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g(\cdot), \eta) \triangleq Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta)), \quad (6)$$

where $Q_{\text{AD}} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to both of its arguments. More specifically, for a fixed value of the second argument, $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in the first argument. Similarly, for a fixed value of the first argument, $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in the second argument. The adversary selects its strategy from its action set, which includes all possible noise distributions², i.e., $\Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N = \{g(\cdot) \mid g : \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is a valid pdf}\}$.

¹Note that this is a strong assumption about the adversary. In practice, the adversary may be weaker, as they could also have a noisy estimate of \mathbf{u} . Nonetheless, our proposed scheme and main insights would still apply in such cases.

²We even allow discrete noise distributions by using impulse (Dirac delta) functions, as is standard in signals and systems.

For this game, we aim to determine the **Stackelberg equilibrium**. Specifically, we assume that the DC acts as the leader, while the adversary plays the role of the follower in this Stackelberg game. For each action $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$ to which the DC commits, we define the set of the adversary's best responses as

$$\mathcal{B}_N^\eta \triangleq \arg \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g(\cdot), \eta). \quad (7)$$

For each $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$ chosen by the DC, the adversary may select any element $g^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$. Note that while each element in the set \mathcal{B}_N^η provides the same utility for the adversary, different elements may result in varying utilities for the DC. The utility of the DC is at least $\min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta} \text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta)$. We define

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_N^\eta \triangleq \arg \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta} \text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta). \quad (8)$$

Definition 1. For any $g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}$ and $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$, a pair $(g(\cdot), \eta)$ is an achievable pair, if and only if we have $g(\cdot) \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_N^\eta$.

Note that if we consider a $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$ and fix it, then for all $g(\cdot) \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_N^\eta$, the value of $\text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta)$ remains the same. We define

$$\eta_N^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}} \text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta), \quad (9)$$

where in the above $g(\cdot)$ is an arbitrary element in $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_N^\eta$. We define Stackelberg equilibrium as follows.

Definition 2. For any $g^*(\cdot) \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\eta_N^*}$, we call the pair of $(\text{U}_{\text{DC}}(g^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*), \text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*))$ as an Stackelberg equilibrium. Interchangeably, we call $(\text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*), \text{PA}(g^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*))$ or $(\text{MSE}^*, \text{PA}^*)$ as Stackelberg equilibrium.

The objective is to characterize Stackelberg equilibrium of the game.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present the main results of the paper. Note that based on (6) and (9), we have

$$\eta_N^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}} \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta} Q_{\text{DC}}(\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta)). \quad (10)$$

At first glance, (10) presents a complex optimization problem due to two main factors: (i) It relies on the utility functions of both the adversary and the DC, with the only assumptions being that the adversary's utility is strictly increasing in both arguments, while the DC's utility is non-increasing in the first argument and non-decreasing in the second, and (ii) it involves an infinite-dimensional optimization over the entire space of possible noise distributions $g(\cdot)$ chosen by the adversary.

Following the same approach used in [17], we address issue (i) by formulating an intermediate optimization problem that does not depend on the players' utility functions. For each $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, we introduce the following optimization problem:

$$c_\eta^N(\alpha) \triangleq \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \quad (11)$$

We demonstrate that the equilibrium of the Stackelberg game can be easily obtained using the function $c_\eta^N(\alpha)$, as defined in (11), through a two-dimensional optimization problem outlined in Algorithm 1. Algorithm 1 takes as inputs the utility functions $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $Q_{\text{DC}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, and $c_\eta^N(\cdot)$ — the result of OPT. 1 — and outputs $\hat{\eta}_N$. The following theorem confirms the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $\hat{\eta}_N$ be the output of Algorithm 1. We have $\eta_N^* = \hat{\eta}_N$.*

The proof of this theorem can be found in Section IV.

Algorithm 1 is a two-dimensional optimization problem which is computationally feasible for well-behaved utility functions. Thus, much of the technical challenges of finding η_N^* lies in obtaining a characterization of the function $c_\eta^N(\cdot)$. Theorem 2 resolves this task. We denote the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of \mathbf{n}_h by $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}$ and the PDF of \mathbf{n}_h by $f_{\mathbf{n}_h}$. Recall that $\Pr(|\mathbf{n}_h| > \Delta) = 0$, for some $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(-\Delta) = 0$, and $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(\Delta) = 1$. We assume that $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(\cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function in $[-\Delta, \Delta]$, i.e., for all $-\Delta \leq a < b \leq \Delta$, we have $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(a) < F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(b)$.

Theorem 2. *For any $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$, $N \geq 2$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, we have*

$$c_\eta^N(\alpha) = \frac{h_\eta^*(\alpha)}{4\alpha}, \quad (12)$$

Algorithm 1 Finding the Optimal Decision Region

- 1: **Input:** Functions $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $Q_{\text{DC}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, and $c_\eta^N(\cdot)$
 - 2: **Output:** $\hat{\eta}_N$
 - 3: **Step 1:**
 - 4: Calculate the set $\mathcal{L}_\eta^N = \arg \max_{0 < \alpha \leq 1} Q_{\text{AD}}(c_\eta^N(\alpha), \alpha)$
 - 5: **Step 2:**
 - 6: Calculate $\hat{\eta}_N = \arg \max_{\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}} \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_\eta^N} Q_{\text{DC}}(c_\eta^N(\alpha), \alpha)$
-

Algorithm 2 Characterizing the Optimal Distribution for Adversary

- 1: **Input:** The function $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(n_h)$, η_N^* . For simplicity here, in the description of algorithm we use η^* instead of η_N^* .
 - 2: **Output:** $g^*({n_a}_{a \in \mathcal{T}})$
 - 3: Let $k_{\eta^*}(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta^*\Delta}^{\Delta} f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$ and $\nu_{\eta^*}(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta^*\Delta}^{\Delta} (x+z)^2 f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$, for $z \in [(\eta^* - 1)\Delta, (\eta^* + 1)\Delta]$.
 - 4: Let $h_{\eta^*}(q) \triangleq \nu_{\eta^*}(k_{\eta^*}^{-1}(q))$ and $h_{\eta^*}^*(q)$ be the concave envelop of $h_{\eta^*}(q)$, for $q \in [0, 1]$.
 - 5: **Step 1:**
 - 6: Calculate $\mathcal{L}_{\eta^*} = \arg \max_{0 < \alpha \leq 1} Q_{\text{AD}}(\frac{h_{\eta^*}^*(\alpha)}{4\alpha}, \alpha)$, and choose α as an arbitrary element of \mathcal{L}_{η^*} .
 - 7: **Step 2:**
 - 8: **if** $h_{\eta^*}^*(\alpha) = h_{\eta^*}(\alpha)$ **then**
 - 9: Let $z_1 \triangleq k_{\eta^*}^{-1}(\alpha)$
 - 10: Output $f^*(z) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(z + z_1) + \frac{1}{2}\delta(z - z_1)$
 - 11: **else**
 - 12: Find $q_1 < \alpha < q_2$, such that $h_{\eta^*}^*(q_1) = h_{\eta^*}(q_1)$ and $h_{\eta^*}^*(q_2) = h_{\eta^*}(q_2)$, and for all $q_1 \leq q \leq q_2$, we have

$$h_{\eta^*}^*(q) = \frac{h_{\eta^*}(q_2) - h_{\eta^*}(q_1)}{q_2 - q_1}(q - q_1) + h_{\eta^*}(q_1).$$
 - 13: Let $z_1 \triangleq k_{\eta^*}^{-1}(q_1)$, $z_2 \triangleq k_{\eta^*}^{-1}(q_2)$, $\beta_1 \triangleq \frac{q_2 - \alpha}{2(q_2 - q_1)}$, and $\beta_2 \triangleq \frac{\alpha - q_1}{2(q_2 - q_1)}$.
 - 14: Output $f^*(z) = \beta_1\delta(z + z_1) + \beta_2\delta(z + z_2) + \beta_1\delta(z - z_1) + \beta_2\delta(z - z_2)$
 - 15: **end if**
 - 16: **Step 3:**
 - 17: $g^*({n_a}_{a \in \mathcal{T}}) = \prod_{a \in \mathcal{T}} \delta(z - n_a) f^*(z)$.
-

where $h_{\eta^*}^*(q)$ is the concave envelop of the function³ $h_{\eta^*}(q) \triangleq \nu_{\eta^*}(k_{\eta^*}^{-1}(q))$, $0 \leq q \leq 1$, for $\nu_{\eta^*}(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta^*\Delta}^{\Delta} (x+z)^2 f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$ and $k_{\eta^*}(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta^*\Delta}^{\Delta} f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$, $(\eta^* - 1)\Delta \leq z \leq (\eta^* + 1)\Delta$.

The proof of this lemma is in Section V.

Remark 1. In the process of proving Theorem 2, we in fact characterize an optimal noise distribution $g^*(\cdot)$ as stated in Algorithm 2. This algorithm takes $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(\cdot)$, and η_N^* as inputs and outputs $g^*({n_a}_{a \in \mathcal{T}})$, which is the best noise distribution of the adversary.

Next we show that in the presence of at least one honest node, i.e., in the minimal trust assumption scenario, the utility of the DC at equilibrium remains constant despite an increase in the number of adversarial nodes. Consider the following theorem.

Theorem 3. For any $N \geq 2$, $\eta_N^* = \eta_2^*$. Moreover, for any $g_N^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}$, and $g_2^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_2^{\eta_2^*}$, we have

$$\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*) = \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta_2^*). \quad (13)$$

In addition, we have

$$\min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}} \mathbf{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta_N^*) = \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_2^{\eta_2^*}} \mathbf{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta_2^*) \quad (14)$$

³Note that since we assumed $F_{\mathbf{n}_h}(\cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function in $[-\Delta, \Delta]$, the inverse function of $k_{\eta^*}(\cdot)$ exists.

The proof of this theorem can be found in Section VI.

Remark 2. Theorem 3 states that the adversary does not gain from increasing the number of adversarial nodes. In other words, the equilibrium does not depend on the number of adversarial nodes, as long as it is more than one. According to (13), what the adversary can attain with multiple nodes, it can achieve with just a single node. Similarly, the attainable utility of the DC at the equilibrium does not decrease with an increase in the number of adversarial nodes. This surprising result demonstrates the effectiveness of the game of coding framework in restraining the adversarial power. In addition, it expands the boundary of coding theory to transcend the fundamental limits of trust assumption.

Remark 3. Note that in Theorem 3, we make no assumptions on the utility functions of the adversary and the DC, apart from the requirement that the adversary's utility is strictly increasing in both arguments and the DC's utility is non-increasing in the first and non-decreasing in the second.

IV. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Note that (10) can be reformulated as

$$\eta_N^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}} \min_{(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N} Q_{\text{DC}}(\beta, \alpha), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_\eta^N \triangleq \{(\text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g^*(\cdot), \eta)) \mid g^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta\}. \quad (16)$$

To prove Theorem 1, we first show the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_\eta^N \triangleq \{(c_\eta^N(\alpha), \alpha) \mid 0 < \alpha \leq 1\}, \quad (17)$$

where $c_\eta^N(\alpha)$ is defined in (11). For any $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}$, $\mathcal{J}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\eta^N$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary element $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$. We aim to show $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\eta^N$. Based on the definition of \mathcal{C}_η^N in (17), we show that for any $g^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$, and $\alpha \triangleq \text{PA}(g^*(\cdot), \eta)$, the distribution $g^*(\cdot)$ is one of the optimal solutions of the following maximization problem

$$\max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \quad (18)$$

We prove this claim by contradiction. Assume that this is not the case. Let⁴

$$g_1(\cdot) = \arg \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \quad (19)$$

Based on our contradictory hypothesis that $g^*(\cdot)$ is not an optimal solution of (18), one can verify that

$$\text{MSE}(g_1(\cdot), \eta) > \text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta) \quad (20)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_1(\cdot), \eta) &= Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_1(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_1(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_1(\cdot), \eta), \alpha) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{>} Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta), \alpha) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g^*(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &= \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g^*(\cdot), \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where (a) follows from the facts that based on (19), $\text{PA}(g_1(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha$ and also that $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to its second argument, (b) follows from (20) and also that $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to its first argument, and (c) follows from the definition of α .

However, (21) implies that $\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_1(\cdot), \eta) > \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g^*(\cdot), \eta)$, which is a contradiction, since $g^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$. Thus, our first contradictory hypothesis is wrong, and the statement of this lemma is valid. \square

⁴In the case that the optimization problem (19) has more than one solution, just pick one of them randomly as the noise function $g_1(\cdot)$.

Now we prove Theorem 1. Recall that

$$\mathcal{L}_\eta^N = \arg \max_{0 < \alpha \leq 1} Q_{\text{AD}}(c_\eta^N(\alpha), \alpha). \quad (22)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{K}_\eta^N = \{(c_\eta^N(\alpha), \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{L}_\eta^N\} \quad (23)$$

Based in (16), to complete the proof we show

$$\mathcal{J}_\eta^N = \mathcal{K}_\eta^N \quad (24)$$

we first show that $\mathcal{J}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, and then prove $\mathcal{K}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$.

A. *Proof of $\mathcal{J}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$*

Consider $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$. We claim that $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, and show this by contradiction. Assume, as a contradictory hypothesis, that it is not the case. According to Lemma 1 $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\eta^N$. Since we assumed that $(\beta, \alpha) \notin \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, based on the definition in (23), there exists $(b, a) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, such that we have

$$Q_{\text{AD}}(b, a) > Q_{\text{AD}}(\beta, \alpha). \quad (25)$$

Since $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$, based on the definition in (16) there exists a noise distribution $g_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$, where

$$(\beta, \alpha) = (\text{MSE}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)). \quad (26)$$

Similarly for $(b, a) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, based on the definition in (23), we have $(b, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\eta^N$. Based on the definition in (17), there exists a noise distribution $g_b(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}$, where

$$\text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) \geq a, \quad (27)$$

and $g_b(\cdot)$ is one of the optimal solutions of the following maximization problem

$$\max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq a \quad (28)$$

and we have

$$b = \text{MSE}(g_b(\cdot), \eta). \quad (29)$$

One can verify that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) &= Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_b(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(b, \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} Q_{\text{AD}}(b, a) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{>} Q_{\text{AD}}(\beta, \alpha) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &= \text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where (a) follows from (29), (b) follows from (27) and $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to its second argument, (c) follows from (25), (d) follows from (26). However, (30) implies that $\text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) > \text{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)$, which is a contradiction, since $g_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$. Therefore, our first assumption was wrong, and for each $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$ we have $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$.

B. *Proof of $\mathcal{K}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$*

We prove this by contradiction. Assume that this is not the case. Consider $(b, a) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, where $(b, a) \notin \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$, and the noise distribution $g_b(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}$, where (27), (28), and (29) holds. Now consider a $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$, and the noise distribution $g_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$, where (26) holds. We note that based on Lemma 1, $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\eta^N$. Since $(b, a) \in \mathcal{K}_\eta^N$, based on the definition (16) we have

$$Q_{\text{AD}}(b, a) \geq Q_{\text{AD}}(\beta, \alpha). \quad (31)$$

Consider the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) &= Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_b(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(b, \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} Q_{\text{AD}}(b, a) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} Q_{\text{AD}}(\beta, \alpha) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(\text{MSE}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)) \\ &= \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where (a) follows from (29), (b) follows from (27) and $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to its second argument, (c) follows from (31), (d) follows from (26).

However, (32) implies that $\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) \geq \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)$. On the other hand, since $g_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$, we have $\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta) \geq \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)$. Thus $\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) = \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)$. Consequently, based on (32), we have $Q_{\text{AD}}(b, \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)) = Q_{\text{AD}}(\beta, \alpha)$. Since $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to its second argument, it implies that $\text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) = a$. Thus, we have

$$(b, a) = (\text{MSE}(g_b(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_b(\cdot), \eta)), \quad (33)$$

On the other hand, $g_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$ and $\mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_b(\cdot), \eta) = \mathbf{U}_{\text{AD}}(g_\alpha(\cdot), \eta)$, which implies that $g_b(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta$. Therefore, by definition it implies that $(b, a) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$. This is against our first assumption that $(b, a) \notin \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{K}_\eta^N \subseteq \mathcal{J}_\eta^N$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

V. PROOF OF THE THEOREM 2

Note that for the special case of $N = 2$, for any $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $c_\eta^2(\alpha)$ is indeed the output of Opt. 2 in [17], which has been characterised in Lemma 2 of [17]. More precisely, based on the definition of Opt. 2 in [17] and the statement of Lemma 2 in [17], we have $c_\eta^2(\alpha) = \frac{h_\eta^*(\alpha)}{4\alpha}$ where $h_\eta^*(q)$ is the concave envelop of the function $h_\eta(q) \triangleq \nu_\eta(k_\eta^{-1}(q))$, $0 \leq q \leq 1$, for $\nu_\eta(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta\Delta}^{\Delta} (x+z)^2 f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$ and $k_\eta(z) \triangleq \int_{z-\eta\Delta}^{\Delta} f_{\mathbf{n}_h}(x) dx$, $(\eta-1)\Delta \leq z \leq (\eta+1)\Delta$.

Thus, to prove Theorem 2, we need to show that for any $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $N \leq 2$, we have

$$c_\eta^N(\alpha) = c_\eta^2(\alpha). \quad (34)$$

Recall that for any $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, we have

$$c_\eta^N(\alpha) \triangleq \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \quad (35)$$

To prove 34, for any $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ we first show $c_\eta^N(\alpha) \geq c_\eta^2(\alpha)$, and then $c_\eta^N(\alpha) \leq c_\eta^2(\alpha)$, as follows.

A. *Proving $c_\eta^N(\alpha) \geq c_\eta^2(\alpha)$*

Assume that $g_2^*(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^2$, is a noise distribution that is a solution to (35), for the case of $N = 2$. We utilize $g_2^*(\cdot)$ to create noise for the scenario involving N nodes. Specifically, the adversary employs the distribution of $g_2^*(\cdot)$ to generate noise, denoted by \mathbf{n} . Subsequently, it applies this noise for all $N - 1$ of its nodes. Therefore, for all $a \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $\mathbf{n}_a = \mathbf{n}$. Let $g_N(\cdot)$ be the corresponding distribution for this construction. It can be easily verified that

$$\text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{PA}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha, \quad (36)$$

$$\text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{MSE}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta). \quad (37)$$

Furthermore, Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
c_\eta^N(\alpha) &= \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \\
&\geq \text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \text{MSE}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^2} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \\
&= c_\eta^2(\alpha)
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where (a) follows from (37), (b) follows from the definition of $g_2^*(\cdot)$.

B. Proving $c_\eta^N(\alpha) \leq c_\eta^2(\alpha)$

To prove this, first we show the following lemma.

Lemma 2. For any $N \geq 2$, there exist a solution $g(\{n_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{T}})$ to the optimization problem (35), such that

$$\Pr(\exists i, j \in \mathcal{T}, |\mathbf{n}_i - \mathbf{n}_j| > \eta\Delta) = 0. \tag{39}$$

Proof. Consider a solution $g_N^*(\cdot)$ of the optimization problem (35). Let \mathcal{D} be the event of for all $i, j \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $|\mathbf{n}_i - \mathbf{n}_j| \leq \eta\Delta$. Consider the new noise of $[\mathbf{n}_a|\mathcal{D}]_{a \in \mathcal{T}}$ and let $g_N(\cdot)$ be the corresponding distribution of this construction. Noteworthy that $g_N(\cdot)$ is basically the distribution of $g_N^*(\cdot)$, condition on \mathcal{D} . This implies that when the adversarial noise distribution follows $g_N^*(\cdot)$, given the occurrence of event \mathcal{D} , the noise distribution becomes $g_N(\cdot)$, resulting in

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) = \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}). \tag{40}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{PA}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta) &= \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)) \\
&= \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot)) + \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}^c) \Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N^*(\cdot)) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot)) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot))
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that based on definition of \mathcal{D} , $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}^c) = 0$, and (b) follows from (40).

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) &= \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)) \\
&= \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N(\cdot)) + \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}^c) \Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N(\cdot)) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N(\cdot)) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D})
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that based on definition of \mathcal{D} , $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_{\text{Reg}}; g_N^*(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}^c) = 0$, and (b) follows from the fact that based on definition of $g_N(\cdot)$, we have $\Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N(\cdot)) = 1$.

Based on (41) and (42), we have

$$\text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \geq \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\eta; g_N(\cdot)|\mathcal{D}) \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot)) = \text{PA}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha. \tag{43}$$




Fig. 2. In the first scenario, there are $N - 1$ adversarial nodes and one honest node. The noise distribution of the adversarial nodes is $g_N^*(\cdot)$, which is a solution to (35) and satisfies Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \triangleq \max_{a \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{n}_a|$, and $\mathcal{T} = \{2, 3, \dots, N\}$. In the second scenario there $N - 1$ adversarial nodes and one honest node. The noise of the adversarial nodes is \mathbf{n}_{abs} . In the third scenario, there are one adversarial node and one honest node. The noise of the adversarial node is \mathbf{n}_{abs} .

Let $\mathbf{n}_{\min} \triangleq \min_{i \in [N]} \mathbf{n}_i$, and $\mathbf{n}_{\max} \triangleq \max_{i \in [N]} \mathbf{n}_i$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{u} - \frac{\max(\mathbf{y}) + \min(\mathbf{y})}{2} \right)^2; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta \right] = \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D} \right] \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D}^c \right] \Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D} \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D} \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D} \right] \Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta, \mathcal{D}^c \right] \Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) \\
 &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{n}_{\min} + \mathbf{n}_{\max})^2; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{u} - \frac{\max(\mathbf{y}) + \min(\mathbf{y})}{2} \right)^2; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta \right] \\
 &= \text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta),
 \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that based on definition of \mathcal{D} , we have $\Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) = 0$ and $\Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N^*(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) = 1$, (b) follows from the fact that when the adversarial noise distribution follows $g_N^*(\cdot)$, given the occurrence of event \mathcal{D} , the noise distribution becomes $g_N(\cdot)$, (c) follows from the fact that based on definition of \mathcal{D} , we have $\Pr(\mathcal{D}^c; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) = 0$ and $\Pr(\mathcal{D}; g_N(\cdot) | \mathcal{A}_\eta) = 1$. Combining (43) and (44) implies that $g_N(\cdot)$ is also a solution to (35). This completes the proof of Lemma 2. \square

We use Lemma 2 to prove (35). Consider two scenarios. In Scenario 1 (depicted is Fig. 2), we assume that the adversary is utilizing $g_N^*(\cdot)$, which is a solution to (35) and satisfies Lemma 2. Meaning that,

$$\Pr(\exists i, j \in \mathcal{T}, |\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}| > \eta \Delta; g_N^*(\cdot)) = 0. \tag{45}$$

Let $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \triangleq \max_{a \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{n}_a^{(1)}|$. In the second scenario (depicted is Fig. 2), we assume that $\mathbf{n}_a^{(2)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$, for all $a \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $g_N(\cdot)$ be the corresponding noise distribution of the construction in the second scenario. Essentially, in the second scenario, we presume that all adversarial nodes possess the same noise, which is the noise with the maximum absolute value in scenario 1. Consider the following claim.

Claim 1. We have

$$\text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{PA}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta), \tag{46}$$

and

$$\text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta). \quad (47)$$

Proof. To prove this, we show that for any realization of the noise from both adversarial and honest nodes, which results in an acceptance event in scenario 1, would also lead to an acceptance of the inputs in scenario 2, and vice versa. Moreover, for each of this realization we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|. \quad (48)$$

Let $\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(1)}$ be the set of observed data for scenario 1, and $\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(2)}$ be the set of observed data for scenario 2. It can be easily verified that $\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(2)} \subseteq \underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(1)}$. Therefore,

$$\max(\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(2)}) - \min(\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(2)}) \leq \max(\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(1)}) - \min(\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{(1)}). \quad (49)$$

This implies that any realization of the noise from both adversarial and honest nodes, which results in an acceptance event in scenario 1, would also lead to an acceptance of the inputs in scenario 2. We now prove that it is also true vice versa, and also

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|. \quad (50)$$

Assume that the inputs has been accepted in scenario 2. Consider the following cases

1) $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \geq 0$: We consider two cases:

- $\mathbf{n}_h \neq \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)}$: In this case, one can verify that $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$. On the other hand, since the inputs is accepted in scenario 2, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_h = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)} \leq \eta\Delta. \quad (51)$$

If $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_h$, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_h = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \eta\Delta, \quad (52)$$

where (a) follows from (51). This implies that the inputs is accepted in scenario 1. Furthermore, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|. \quad (53)$$

However, if $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{n}_h$, it implies that $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$, for some $i \in \mathcal{T}$. Based on (45), this implies that the inputs in scenario 1 is also accepted. On the other hand, since $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} = \max_{a \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{n}_a^{(1)}|$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \geq 0$, it implies that

$|\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$, which leads to

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}. \quad (54)$$

Moreover, we have

$$-\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \leq \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}, \quad (55)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$, (b) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$. (55) leads to

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h. \quad (56)$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(c)}{=} |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|, \quad (57)$$

where (a) follows from (54), (b) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$, (c) follows from (56).

- $\mathbf{n}_h = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)}$: In this case, we have $0 \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \leq \mathbf{n}_h \leq \Delta$. This implies that for all $i \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $|\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \leq \Delta$. Consequently, for all $i, j \in [N]$, we have

$$|\mathbf{y}_i^{(1)} - \mathbf{y}_j^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}| \leq 2\Delta \leq \eta\Delta, \quad (58)$$

meaning that the inputs in scenario 1 is accepted. Furthermore, since $|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \leq \mathbf{n}_h$, for all $j \in \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h| = \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h. \quad (59)$$

Let $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}$, for some $j \in \mathcal{T}$. This implies that

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h| \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(c)}{=} |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|, \quad (60)$$

where (a) and (c) follows from (59), and (b) follows from $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}$.

Thus, for the case of $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \geq 0$, any realization of the noises that leads to acceptance in scenario 2 would also result in an acceptance event in scenario 1, and vice versa, and also (50) is valid in this case as well.

2) $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} < 0$: We consider two cases:

- $\mathbf{n}_h \neq \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}$: In this case, one can verify that $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$. On the other hand, since the inputs is accepted in scenario 2, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_h - \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)} \leq \eta\Delta. \quad (61)$$

If $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_h$, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_h - \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} = \mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} - \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \eta\Delta, \quad (62)$$

where (a) follows from (61). This implies that the inputs is accepted is scenario 1. Furthermore, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|. \quad (63)$$

However, if $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{n}_h$, it implies that $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$, for some $i \in \mathcal{T}$. Based on (45), this implies that the inputs in scenario 1 is also accepted. On the other hand, since $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} = \max_{a \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{n}_a^{(1)}|$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} < 0$, it implies that

$|\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$, which leads to

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| = -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}. \quad (64)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} \leq -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}, \quad (65)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}$, (b) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$. (65) leads to

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_h. \quad (66)$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \stackrel{(a)}{=} -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(c)}{=} |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|, \quad (67)$$

where (a) follows from (64), (b) follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}$, (c) follows from (66).

- $\mathbf{n}_h = \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}$: In this case, we have $0 > -|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = \mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \geq \mathbf{n}_h \geq -\Delta$. This implies that for all $i \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $|\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| = -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} \leq \Delta$. Consequently, for all $i, j \in [N]$, we have

$$|\mathbf{y}_i^{(1)} - \mathbf{y}_j^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_i^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}| \leq 2\Delta \leq \eta\Delta, \quad (68)$$

meaning that the inputs in scenario 1 is accepted. Furthermore, since $|\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}}| \leq |\mathbf{n}_h| = -\mathbf{n}_h$, for all $j \in \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h| = -\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_h. \quad (69)$$

Let $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}$, for some $j \in \mathcal{T}$. This implies that

$$|\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(1)}| = |\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} + \mathbf{n}_h| \stackrel{(a)}{=} -\mathbf{n}_j^{(1)} - \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} - \mathbf{n}_h \stackrel{(c)}{=} |\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} + \mathbf{n}_h| = |\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(2)} + \mathbf{n}_{\min}^{(2)}|, \quad (70)$$

where (a) and (c) follows from (69), and (b) follows from $\mathbf{n}_{\max}^{(1)} = \mathbf{n}_j^{(1)}$.

Consequently, for the case of $\mathbf{n}_{\text{abs}} < 0$, any realization of the noises that leads to acceptance in scenario 2 would also result in an acceptance event in scenario 1, and vice versa, and also (50) is valid in this case as well.

Based on the above cases, one can verify that

$$\text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{PA}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha, \quad (71)$$

and

$$\text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) \geq \text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta). \quad (72)$$

On the other hand, since $g_N^*(\cdot)$ is a solution to (35), we have

$$\text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta) \geq \text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta). \quad (73)$$

This implies that

$$\text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) = \text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta), \quad (74)$$

which completes the proof. \square

Consider the third scenario (depicted in Fig. 2) in which there are 2 nodes, one adversarial and the other honest. Assume that the behavior of the adversary is characterized as follows: The adversary instantiates $N - 1$ instances of adversarial nodes locally and utilizes $g_N(\cdot)$ as the noise distribution, outputting \mathbf{n}_{abs} as its noise distribution in this scenario. More precisely, in this scenario, instead of having $N - 1$ instances of the same noise value, the adversary employs just one of them. Let $g_2(\cdot)$ be the corresponding noise distribution in this construction. One can easily verify that

$$\text{PA}(g_2(\cdot), \eta) = \text{PA}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha, \quad (75)$$

and

$$\text{MSE}(g_2(\cdot), \eta) = \text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta). \quad (76)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_\eta^N(\alpha) &= \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^N} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \\ &\quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \\ &= \text{MSE}(g_N(\cdot), \eta) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \text{MSE}(g_2(\cdot), \eta) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max_{g(\cdot) \in \Lambda_{\text{AD}}^2} \text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta) \\ &\quad \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta) \geq \alpha \\ &= c_\eta^2(\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where (a) follows from (76), (b) follows from (75). This completes the proof.

VI. PROOF OF THE THEOREM 3

We prove Theorem 3. Based on (34) and Algorithm 1, we have for any $N \geq 2$, $\eta_N^* = \eta_2^*$.

Recall that

$$\eta_N^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}} \min_{(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_\eta^N} Q_{\text{DC}}(\beta, \alpha), \quad (78)$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_\eta^N \triangleq \{(\text{MSE}(g^*(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g^*(\cdot), \eta)) \mid g^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^\eta\}. \quad (79)$$

Remark 4. A direct consequence of (24) and (34) is that for any $\eta \in \Lambda_{\text{DC}}$, $N \geq 2$, $\mathcal{J}_\eta^N = \mathcal{J}_\eta^2$.

In addition, consider $g_N^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}$ and $g_2^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_2^{\eta_2^*}$. Let $(b_N, a_N) \triangleq (\text{MSE}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta))$, and $(b_2, a_2) \triangleq (\text{MSE}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta))$. Note that based on (16), $(b_N, a_N) \in \mathcal{J}_{\eta_N^*}^N$ and $(b_2, a_2) \in \mathcal{J}_{\eta_2^*}^2$. Since $\eta_N^* = \eta_2^*$, Remark 4 implies that $(b_2, a_2) \in \mathcal{J}_{\eta_N^*}^N$. Moreover, based on definition (16), we know that for all elements of $\mathcal{J}_{\eta_N^*}^N$, the value of $Q_{\text{AD}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is same. Thus,

$$Q_{\text{AD}}(b_N, a_N) = Q_{\text{AD}}(b_2, a_2) \quad (80)$$

This implies that

$$U_{\text{AD}}(g_N^*(\cdot), \eta_N^*) \stackrel{(a)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(b_N, a_N) \stackrel{(b)}{=} Q_{\text{AD}}(b_2, a_2) \stackrel{(c)}{=} U_{\text{AD}}(g_2^*(\cdot), \eta_2^*) \quad (81)$$

where (a) and (c) follows from (6), and (b) follows from (80). This completes the proof of (13).

To complete the proof of Theorem 3, we show (14). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}} \mathsf{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}} Q_{\text{DC}}(\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta)) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \min_{(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_{\eta_N^*}^N} Q_{\text{DC}}(\beta, \alpha) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \min_{(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{J}_{\eta_2^*}^2} Q_{\text{DC}}(\beta, \alpha) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_N^{\eta_N^*}} Q_{\text{DC}}(\text{MSE}(g(\cdot), \eta), \text{PA}(g(\cdot), \eta)) \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{=} \min_{g(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_2^{\eta_2^*}} \mathsf{U}_{\text{DC}}(g(\cdot), \eta)
\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

where (a) and (e) follows from (5), (b) and (d) follows from the definition of (16), (c) follows from Remark 4 and the fact that $\eta_N^* = \eta_2^*$. This completes the proof of (14).

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Guruswami, A. Rudra, and M. Sudan, *Essential Coding Theory*. Draft is Available, 2022.
- [2] Q. Yu, S. Li, N. Raviv, S. M. M. Kalan, M. Soltanolkotabi, and S. A. Avestimehr, “Lagrange coded computing: Optimal design for resiliency, security, and privacy,” in *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1215–1225, PMLR, 2019.
- [3] R. M. Roth, “Analog error-correcting codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 7, pp. 4075–4088, 2020.
- [4] J. Sliwinski and R. Wattenhofer, “Blockchains cannot rely on honesty,” in *The 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2020)*, 2019.
- [5] R. Han, Z. Sui, J. Yu, J. Liu, and S. Chen, “Fact and fiction: Challenging the honest majority assumption of permissionless blockchains,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 817–831, 2021.
- [6] J. S. Gans and H. Halaburda, ““Zero Cost” majority attacks on permissionless blockchains,” tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research, 2023.
- [7] J. Thaler *et al.*, “Proofs, arguments, and zero-knowledge,” *Foundations and Trends® in Privacy and Security*, vol. 4, no. 2–4, pp. 117–660, 2022.
- [8] T. Liu, X. Xie, and Y. Zhang, “ZkCNN: Zero knowledge proofs for convolutional neural network predictions and accuracy,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 2968–2985, 2021.
- [9] Z. Xing, Z. Zhang, J. Liu, Z. Zhang, M. Li, L. Zhu, and G. Russello, “Zero-knowledge proof meets machine learning in verifiability: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14848*, 2023.
- [10] C. Weng, K. Yang, X. Xie, J. Katz, and X. Wang, “Mystique: Efficient conversions for Zero-Knowledge proofs with applications to machine learning,” in *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pp. 501–518, 2021.
- [11] P. Mohassel and Y. Zhang, “SecureML: A system for scalable privacy-preserving machine learning,” in *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pp. 19–38, IEEE, 2017.
- [12] S. Lee, H. Ko, J. Kim, and H. Oh, “vCNN: Verifiable convolutional neural network based on zk-snarks,” *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2024.
- [13] S. Garg, A. Goel, S. Jha, S. Mahloujifar, M. Mahmoody, G.-V. Policharla, and M. Wang, “Experimenting with zero-knowledge proofs of training,” *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023.
- [14] S. Chen, J. H. Cheon, D. Kim, and D. Park, “Interactive proofs for rounding arithmetic,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 122706–122725, 2022.
- [15] S. Garg, A. Jain, Z. Jin, and Y. Zhang, “Succinct zero knowledge for floating point computations,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 1203–1216, 2022.
- [16] S. Setty, V. Vu, N. Panpalia, B. Braun, A. J. Blumberg, and M. Walfish, “Taking proof-based verified computation a few steps closer to practicality,” in *21st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 12)*, pp. 253–268, 2012.
- [17] H. A. Nodehi, V. R. Cadambe, and M. A. Maddah-Ali, “Game of coding: Beyond trusted majorities,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16643*, 2024.