

# Notes on Sonic

arnaucube

April 2022

## Abstract

Notes taken while reading Sonic paper [1]. Usually while reading papers I take handwritten notes, this document contains some of them rewritten to *LaTeX*.

The notes are not complete, don't include all the steps neither all the proofs.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Sonic</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Structured Reference String . . . . .	1
1.2	System of constraints . . . . .	1
1.2.1	The basic Sonic protocol . . . . .	3
1.2.2	Polynomial Commitment Scheme . . . . .	4
1.3	Succinct signatures of correct computation . . . . .	4

## 1 Sonic

### 1.1 Structured Reference String

$$\{\{g^{x^i}\}_{i=-d}^d, \{g^{\alpha x^i}\}_{i=-d, i \neq 0}^d, \{h^{x^i}, h^{\alpha x^i}\}_{i=-d}^d, e(g, h^\alpha)\}$$

### 1.2 System of constraints

Multiplication constraint:  $a \cdot b = c$

$Q$  linear constraints:

$$a \cdot u_q + b \cdot v_q + c \cdot w_q = k_q$$

with  $u_q, v_q, w_q \in \mathbb{F}^n$ , and  $k_q \in \mathbb{F}_p$ .

Example:  $x^2 + y^2 = z$

$$a = (x, y), \quad b = (x, y), \quad c = (x^2, y^2)$$

- i.  $(x, y) \cdot (1, 0) + (x, y) \cdot (-1, 0) + (x^2, y^2) \cdot (0, 0) = 0 \longrightarrow x - x = 0$
- ii.  $(x, y) \cdot (0, 1) + (x, y) \cdot (0, -1) + (x^2, y^2) \cdot (0, 0) = 0 \longrightarrow y - y = 0$
- iii.  $(x, y) \cdot (0, 0) + (x, y) \cdot (0, 0) + (x^2, y^2) \cdot (1, 1) = z \longrightarrow x^2 + y^2 = z$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= (1, 0) & v_1 &= (-1, 0) & w_1 &= (0, 0) & k_1 &= 0 \\ u_2 &= (0, 1) & v_2 &= (0, -1) & w_2 &= (0, 0) & k_2 &= 0 \\ u_3 &= (0, 0) & v_3 &= (0, 0) & w_3 &= (1, 1) & k_3 &= z \end{aligned}$$

Compress  $n$  multiplication constraints into an equation in formal indeterminate  $Y$ :

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i b_i - c_i) \cdot Y^i = 0$$

encode into negative exponents of  $Y$ :

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i b_i - c_i) \cdot Y^{-i} = 0$$

Also, compress the  $Q$  linear constraints, scaling by  $Y^n$  to preserve linear independence:

$$\sum_{q=1}^Q (a \cdot u_q + b \cdot v_q + c \cdot w_q - k_q) \cdot Y^{q+n} = 0$$

Polys:

$$u_i(Y) = \sum_{q=1}^Q Y^{q+n} \cdot u_{q,i}$$

$$v_i(Y) = \sum_{q=1}^Q Y^{q+n} \cdot v_{q,i}$$

$$w_i(Y) = -Y^i - Y^{-1} + \sum_{q=1}^Q Y^{q+n} \cdot w_{q,i}$$

$$k(Y) = \sum_{q=1}^Q Y^{q+n} \cdot k_q$$

Combine the multiplicative and linear constraints to:

$$a \cdot u(Y) + b \cdot v(Y) + c \cdot w(Y) + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i (Y^i + Y^{-i}) - k(Y) = 0$$

where  $a \cdot u(Y) + b \cdot v(Y) + c \cdot w(Y)$  is embedded into the constant term of the polynomial  $t(X, Y)$ .

Define  $r(X, Y)$  s.t.  $r(X, Y) = r(XY, 1)$ .

$$\implies r(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i X^i Y^i + b_i X^{-i} Y^{-i} + c_i X^{-i-n} Y^{-i-n})$$

$$s(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i(Y) X^{-i} + v_i(Y) X^i + w_i(Y) X^{i+n})$$

$$r'(X, Y) = r(X, Y) + s(X, Y)$$

$$t(X, Y) = r(X, Y) + r'(X, Y) - k(Y)$$

The coefficient of  $X^0$  in  $t(X, Y)$  is the left-hand side of the equation.

Sonic demonstrates that the constant term of  $t(X, Y)$  is zero, thus demonstrating that our constraint system is satisfied.

### 1.2.1 The basic Sonic protocol

1. Prover constructs  $r(X, Y)$  using their hidden witness
2. Prover commits to  $r(X, 1)$ , setting the maximum degree to  $n$
3. Verifier sends random challenge  $y$
4. Prover commits to  $t(X, y)$ . The commitment scheme ensures that  $t(X, y)$  has no constant term.
5. Verifier sends random challenge  $z$
6. Prover opens commitments to  $r(z, 1), r(z, y), t(z, y)$
7. Verifier calculates  $r'(z, y)$ , and checks that

$$r(z, y) \cdot r'(z, y) - k(y) == t(z, y)$$

Steps 3 and 5 can be made non-interactive by the Fiat-Shamir transformation.

### 1.2.2 Polynomial Commitment Scheme

Sonic uses an adaptation of KZG [2], want:

- i. *evaluation binding*, i.e. given a commitment  $F$ , an adversary cannot open  $F$  to two different evaluations  $v_1$  and  $v_2$
- ii. *bounded polynomial extractable*, i.e. any algebraic adversary that opens a commitment  $F$  knows an opening  $f(X)$  with powers  $-d \leq i \leq \max, i \neq 0$ .

PC scheme (adaptation of KZG):

- i. Commit(info,  $f(X)$ )  $\rightarrow F$ :

$$F = g^{\alpha \cdot x^{d-\max}} \cdot f(x)$$

- ii. Open(info,  $F$ ,  $z$ ,  $f(x)$ )  $\rightarrow (f(z), W)$ :

$$w(X) = \frac{f(X) - f(z)}{X - z}$$

$$W = g^{w(x)}$$

- iii. Verify(info,  $F$ ,  $z$ , ( $v$ ,  $W$ ))  $\rightarrow 0/1$ :

Check:

$$e(W, h^{\alpha \cdot x}) \cdot e(g^v W^{-z}, h^\alpha) == e(F, h^{x^{-d+\max}})$$

### 1.3 Succinct signatures of correct computation

Signature of correct computation to ensure that an element  $s = s(z, y)$  for a known polynomial

$$s(X, Y) = \sum_{i,j=-d}^d s_{i,j} \cdot X^i \cdot Y^j$$

Use the structure of  $s(X, Y)$  to prove its correct calculation using a *permutation argument*  $\rightarrow$  *grand-product argument* inspired by Bayer and Groth, and Bootle et al.

Restrict to constraint systems where  $s(X, Y)$  can be expressed as the sum of  $M$  polynomials. Where  $j$ -th poly is of the form:

$$\Psi_j(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{j,\sigma_j,i} \cdot X^i \cdot Y^{\sigma_j,i}$$

where  $\sigma_j$  is the fixed polynomial permutation, and  $\phi_{j,i} \in \mathbb{F}$  are the coefficients.

WIP

## References

- [1] Mary Maller, Sean Bowe, Markulf Kohlweiss, and Sarah Meiklejohn. Sonic: Zero-knowledge snarks from linear-size universal and updateable structured reference strings. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2019/099, 2019. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/099>.
- [2] A. Kate, G. M. Zaverucha, , and I. Goldberg. Constant-size commitments to polynomials and their application, 2010. <https://www.iacr.org/archive/asiacrypt2010/6477178/6477178.pdf>.