

Protecting the ‘Stop Using My Data’ Right through Blockchain-assisted Evidence Generation

Fan Zhang*, Peng Liu*

*Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

In order to provide personalized services to users, Internet-based platforms collect and utilize user-generated behavioral data. Although the ‘stop using my data’ right should be a fundamental data right, which allows individuals to request their personal data to be no longer utilized by online platforms, the existing preventive data protection measures (e.g., cryptographic data elimination, differential privacy) are unfortunately not applicable. This work aims to develop the first Evidence Generation Framework for deterring post-acquisition data right violations. We formulated the ‘stop using my data’ problem, which captures a vantage facet of the multi-faceted notion of ‘right to be forgotten’. We designed and implemented the first blockchain-assisted system to generate evidence for deterring the violations of the ‘stop using my data’ right. Our system employs a novel two-stage evidence generation protocol whose efficacy is ensured by a newly proposed Lemma. To validate our framework, we conducted a case study on recommendation systems with systematic evaluation experiments using two real-world datasets: the measured success rate exceeds 99%.

I. INTRODUCTION

The advent of Internet-based platforms and applications has intensified the prevailing concerns about users’ **rights** on personal data, thereby posing an enduring research challenge. Despite the research community’s persistent efforts, which have resulted in a plethora of system and protocol design proposals, online platforms and applications continue to utilize users’ behavioral data (e.g., purchase activities), leaving important data right protection issues unaddressed [1], [2]. As reported in article [3], 63% of Internet users believe most companies are not transparent about how their data is used. For instance, consider a scenario where you request an e-commerce platform to stop using your personal shopping records. If this data right protection request is taken seriously, the recommendation system running on the platform would cease to suggest products/items derived from your prior purchases. Contrarily, the statistics obtained by various studies, including [3], reveal a significant deviation. Despite submitting the request, you may notice that the recommendation system continues to recommend items linked with your past preferences [4]. Such a situation not only violates users’ control over their personal data but also poses significant threats to

the sanctity of data rights placed by law (and regulations) [5], [6].

In order to deal with the potential data right violations, several frameworks have been proposed to protect user data rights after data has been collected, embedding concepts such as ‘the right to be forgotten’, which empowers users to demand the deletion or removal of personal data from online platforms, especially when the data in question is obsolete, irrelevant, or no longer serves its original purpose [7]. The European Union has established this right through legal frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [8], [9]. However, it turns out to be very challenging to guarantee that every ‘stop using my data’ request is indeed honored by the corresponding online platform.

Regarding why it is very challenging to guarantee, although one main reason is that most companies are not transparent about how their data is used, lack of sufficient data right protection technologies is obviously another main reason. Previous technological works have primarily concentrated on strategies to eliminate users’ personal data **prior** to its utilization. This has been predominantly achieved through the use of encryption techniques and the principle of differential privacy [10], [11]. Data encryption, a topic diligently studied over the years, consists of cryptographic systems and protocols. These systems and protocols ensure data elimination by *preventively* converting data into an useless format: only the parties knowing the decryption key(s) can make the data useful again [12], [13]. Differential privacy (e.g., [14], [15]), on the other hand, is another *preventive* measure that primarily deals with adding a certain amount of random noise to the data. Although differential privacy mechanisms do not directly achieve data elimination, they enable users to hide Personal Identifiable Information (PII) from online platforms.

Despite these remarkable advances, a glaring **gap** in the literature pertains to the lack of strategies addressing the data right protection needs arising from post-acquisition data utilization. Because the user behavioral data is being routinely acquired by online platforms, all the aforementioned preventive technologies, including differential privacy, would become **not applicable**. In essence, while preventative mechanisms are progressing, technologies addressing the data right protection needs once data has been obtained and utilized are still largely unexplored in the literature.

In this paper, we seek to develop the first Evidence Generation Framework for deterring post-acquisition data right violations. In particular, we formulate the **‘stop using my data’ problem** by advocating that this right is a fundamental

Fan Zhang and Peng Liu are with Penn State University, State College, PA, 16801 (email: fxz5095@psu.edu, pxl20@psu.edu).

aspect of data protection, allowing individual users to request their behavioral data to be no longer utilized by a particular platform. Note that since this problem is restricted to users' right on whether behavioral data (e.g., what items are purchased and when) can be utilized by online platforms, our problem is orthogonal to PII protection, and therefore, our framework is **not** solving a privacy problem.

Since preventive technologies, including differential privacy, are not applicable, our framework focuses on reactively deterring data right violations. In particular, in our threat model, after receiving the "stop use my data" request from a user, if the recipient platform lets its algorithm (e.g., recommendation system) continue utilizing the user's behavioral data, the platform is an attacker. Accordingly, our goal is as follows: through an evidence generation system, the evidence generator aims to collect compelling evidences showing that the suspect is indeed an attacker.

Technical challenges. *Data Accessibility:* As mentioned earlier, most companies are not transparent about how their data is used. As a result, the platform inherently has accessibility to all user behavioral data. In contrast, potential victim users can only access their personal data, remaining oblivious to the extensive data owned by others. This disparity introduces a major technical barrier for the evidence generation system.

Grey-box System: Each platform is a grey-box: the outputs can be observed, but the platform is not transparent about how the data is used.

The Lie of User: Users could forge information to defraud the platform compensation, for example, by claiming data right violation without actually asking the platform to stop using their data.

Approach overview. To address the challenge of data accessibility, our framework proposes the creation of special Web3 communities. Since every user who regularly uses the platform could become a potential victim of the violation of his or her 'stop using my data' right, one or more Web3 communities can enable the potential victims to collectively obtain improved data right protection. Each such Web3 community corresponds to one subnet of users. Each Web3 community leverages the blockchain technology to maintain a shared immutable record of user behavioral data, and to foster a decentralized trust-based community for the potential victims. To ensure privacy, the blockchain nodes do not hold any cleartext data; rather, hash values of user data are stored.

To address the challenge of grey-box systems, our framework leverages the approximations (of the black-box components) achieved through the user behavioral data jointly collected by each Web3 community and the computation results of secure Multi-Party Computation (MPC). Note that MPC is adopted to enable each Web3 community's evidence generation system to collectively generate approximate platform outputs in a privacy-preserving manner. Finally, to address the challenge of lie of user, our framework employs blockchains to maintain an immutable record of user behavior and the platform's outputs, thus offering transparency and mitigating the potential dishonest practices.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- This work is the first that formulates the 'stop using my data' problem, which captures a vantage facet/aspect of the multi-faceted notion of 'right to be forgotten'.
- We proposed the first evidence generation framework for solving the 'stop using my data' problem.
- We designed and implemented the first blockchain-assisted system to generate evidence for deterring the violations of the 'stop using my data' right. The system employs a novel two-stage evidence generation protocol whose efficacy is ensured by a newly proposed Lemma. The proof is also provided.
- Towards validating the proposed evidence generation framework, we conduct a case study on recommendation systems with systematic evaluation experiments using two real-world datasets (i.e., the Amazon Magazine dataset and the Amazon Beauty dataset). The measured success rate exceeds 99%.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Right to Be Forgotten

The right to be forgotten is a legal concept that allows individuals to request the removal of their personal information from public records and Internet-based platforms (e.g., E-commerce platforms, social media platforms). This right was introduced by the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in 2018 [16], [17]. The regulation gives individuals the right to have their personal data erased under certain circumstances, such as when the data is no longer necessary for the purpose it was collected, or when a person withdraws her consent for the data to be processed [7].

To exercise the right to be forgotten, individuals must make a formal request to the organization storing their personal data [16]. The organization must then assess whether the request is valid and take appropriate actions, which may include deleting the data or making it anonymous. Implementing the right to be forgotten can be challenging, particularly in the digital age where data can be easily copied and disseminated. Some solutions include data anonymization, encryption and the use of technology to monitor and remove personal information from the Web.

B. Blockchains

The Blockchain technology is revolutionizing the way in which decentralized systems are built. A blockchain is a distributed ledger that records transactions in a transparent, immutable way. Through immutable transaction recording, various communities of stake holders (e.g., buyers and sellers of Bitcoins) can track not only tangible assets such as cash and land but also intangible assets such as patents, copyrights, and branding. A most notable property of the Blockchain technology is that trustworthiness is achieved without the need for intermediaries (e.g., trusted third parties) [18], [19]. The ledger consists of a chain of blocks. Each block contains a unique hash value that identifies itself and is linked to its previous block.

An essential feature of the blockchain technology is its operations on a peer-to-peer network, achieving decentralized

data management [20]. This implies that rather than a singular entity owning and controlling all data, the data is disseminated across numerous nodes in the network. The decentralization feature is critical for dealing with cyber threats. Any modification attempt against a block's content necessitates a consensus from the majority of the network - a task that is practically and computationally infeasible [21]. Since blockchains provide a highly desirable way to track all kinds of assets, the technology has penetrated into various industry sectors, including finance, supply chain management and healthcare.

C. Multi-party Computation

Multi-party computation (MPC) is a cryptographic technique that allows multiple parties to jointly compute a function on their private inputs without revealing any information about them [22], [23]. This technique is useful in scenarios where the parties do not trust each other, but need to collaborate to achieve a common goal. The concept of MPC was first introduced in the 1980s, with the development of secure function evaluation protocols by Andrew Yao [24]. Some of the most widely used MPC protocols include the Secure Multi-Party Computation Protocol (SMC), the Yao's Millionaires Problem Protocol, and the Garbled Circuit Protocol.

MPC involves several steps [25]. First, the parties agree on a protocol to use for computation. Second, each party privately inputs their data into the protocol. Third, the parties exchange messages according to the agreed protocol to compute the desired function. MPC techniques have been widely used in various domains, such as secure data analysis, privacy-preserving machine learning, and secure multiparty computation.

D. Web3 Communities

With increasing concerns on data privacy, security, and control, the Web3 movement signifies a shift in paradigm towards a web that is more decentralized and user-centric [26]. Web3 builds upon the previous iterations of the Internet, namely Web1 and Web2, to address the limitations of these centralized models [27]. By leveraging the innovative capabilities of the blockchain technology, Web3 aims to empower individuals, granting them sovereignty over their own digital identities, data, and transactions.

Distributed ledgers lie at the core of Web3, enabling the creation of decentralized systems that facilitate secure and transparent transactions [28], [29]. Smart contracts, self-executing pieces of code, further enhance the capabilities of Web3 by automating and enforcing agreements without the need for intermediaries [30]. A Web3 community is a virtual community where a group of people with shared digital ownership can work together on achieving common goals.

III. THE "STOP USING MY DATA" PROBLEM

In this section, we formulate the 'stop using my data' problem. The problem is defined based on a general platform model. In addition, we introduce the threat model to further explain the capabilities of attackers and defenders. After that, we design a third-party judge model. Lastly, the challenges inherent in solving the newly formulated problem are discussed.

A. Platform Model

Our platform model intends to cover a variety of internet-based platforms that provide users (e.g., anyone who is at least 18 years old can use Amazon) with meaningful services. Such platforms may include marketplaces, social media platforms, content sharing websites, online service providers, and so on.

Since this work focuses on protecting private *behavioral* data instead of PII (personally identifiable information), the platforms should have the following properties: 1) The operations of the platforms involve not only certain behavioral data (of every user) but also an algorithm that uses the behavioral data as a main input for generating the output shown to a user. For instance, online marketplaces generate recommendations based on the users' purchase histories. For another example, the Google keyboard system makes query suggestions based on a user's previous input habits. 2) The algorithm is a white-box and known to all users, but the decisions on whether to utilize a particular user's behavioral data are made in a black-box (i.e., unknown to users).

Based on these properties of a platform, we give the definition of the 'stop using my data' right:

Definition 3.1 (Stop Using My Data Right): The 'stop using my data' right is a fundamental aspect of data protection, allowing individual users to request that their behavioral data no longer be utilized by a particular platform.

B. Threat Model

The definition of the 'stop using my data' right indicates that the data right protection problem may involve the following parties:

Attacker & Victim: After receiving the "stop use my data" request from a user, if the recipient platform lets its algorithm continue utilizing the user's behavioral data, the platform is an attacker. Accordingly, the user is the victim.

Evidence Generator: Through an evidence generation system, the evidence generator aims to collect compelling evidences showing that the suspect is indeed an attacker. Note that the victim is usually only part of the entire evidence generation system.

Judge: The judge is supposed to examine the collected evidences and decide if the accused is guilty.

In this threat model, the attacker possesses access to all of the behavioral data used in running the platform's algorithm, whereas the evidence generation system is usually only utilizing a small subset of the behavioral data. For example, when recommendation systems are using user behavioral data to make recommendations, the inaccessibility of the database of user purchase histories prevents outsiders (e.g., the victim and his or her allies) from accurately determining whether the recommendations are made based on the victim's purchase history or not.

C. Judge Model

The judge, which is potentially a court of law, is supposed to examine the collected evidences and decide if the accused is guilty. Since the attacker is not assumed a honest party,

the accused platform may certainly deny any “violation of data right” accusations. Moreover, the users who raise an accusation could also be lying.

Therefore, the Judge Model should take all possible consequences of dishonesty into consideration. In particular, the Judge Model assumes that in order to obtain more benefits (e.g., profits), a platform could violate user data rights when processing their behavioral data. Alternatively, users might baselessly claim their data has been misused to pursue monetary compensations. Thus, the Judge should focus on two major tasks: 1) Verifying if the platform has ceased using user data based on the available evidence; 2) Identifying if a user’s allegations of unauthorized data use for compensation are unfounded. To fulfill the first task, the Judge relies on the evidences from the evidence-generation system. To fulfill the second task, it is desirable to maintain a decentralized yet trustworthy record of each user’s behavioral data. Because it is decentralized, the Judge does not need to trust any third parties. Because it is trustworthy, the Judge can assume that users cannot fabricate (or destroy) any evidences. Note that if the trustworthiness comes from the consensus of a peer-to-peer network, then the corresponding privacy-preserving requirements must be met.

D. Challenges




Fig. 1. The problem.

A simplified illustration of the ‘stop using my data’ problem is shown in Figure 1, where only one user has issued the ‘stop using my data’ request. Accordingly, after the request was issued, the brown color components are part of the worst case workflow (of the platform) that totally ignores the request. In contrast, the blue color components are part of the workflow that is really implemented by the platform.

It is clear that if the real workflow and the worst case workflow always generate identical outputs since the request was issued, the real workflow must be violating the user’s data right. However, this straightforward criteria cannot be utilized due to poor feasibility. Because the platform is violating the user’s data right, we must *not* assume that the evidence generation system is endorsed by the platform. Accordingly, the outputs of the worst case workflow are never known to the evidence generation system.

Inability to observe the worst case workflow’s outputs is actually only one of the following challenges we face in solving the ‘stop using my data’ problem.




Fig. 2. The evidence generation framework.

Data Accessibility : The disparity in accessible data represents a significant challenge. The platform inherently has accessibility to all user behavioral data. In contrast, potential victim users can only access their personal data, remaining oblivious to the extensive data owned by others. This disparity introduces a major technical barrier for the evidence generation system.

Grey-box System: Each platform is a grey-box system: the algorithm is public, the outputs can be observed, but it is impossible (for outsiders) to track what behavioral data is utilized (by the algorithm) and what is not. When certain metadata derived from the behavioral data is utilized by the algorithm, the metadata is also kept confidential from outsiders.

The Lie of User: Users could forge information to defraud the platform compensation, for example, by providing false requests (when in reality they did not ask the platform to stop using their data). In this context, we need to ensure that the user is honest and provides truthful data.

IV. FRAMEWORK DESIGN

A. Overview

In this section, we present a framework to address the data right protection challenges identified in the previous section. To address the challenge of data accessibility, our framework lets a group of users to collaboratively collect their behavioral data through the creation of a special Web3 community. Each Web3 community leverages the blockchain technology to maintain a shared immutable record of user behavioral data, and to foster a decentralized trust-based community for the potential victims. To address the challenge of grey-box systems, our framework leverages the approximations (of the platform’s black-box components) achieved through secure Multi-Party Computation (MPC). MPC is adopted to enable each Web3 community’s evidence generation system to collectively generate approximate platform outputs in a privacy-preserving manner. Finally, to tackle lie of user, our framework employs blockchains to maintain a shared immutable record of user behavior and the platform’s outputs, thus offering transparency and mitigating the potential dishonest practices.

The main components of our framework are shown in Figure 2:

User Group: Since every user who regularly uses the platform could become a potential victim of the violation of his or her ‘stop using my data’ right, our framework facilitates the creation of one or more special Web3 communities for the potential victims to *collectively* obtain improved data right protection. Each such Web3 community corresponds to one group of users (of the platform) with similar user behavior (e.g., the users may buy merchants belonging to the same category). Since our framework employs blockchains to maintain a shared immutable record of user behavioral data, Web3 communities are a natural way to foster a decentralized trust-based community for the potential victims.

The Victim User: The victim user is a member of one of the aforementioned Web3 communities. The victim user has asked the platform to stop using his or her user behavioral data, but unfortunately his or her request has been ignored.

Server: The server is a main component of the platform. It establishes the network connections with each user side device. It forwards the outputs of the Target System to users. It also collects the relevant user behavioral data.

Database: The collected user behavioral data are stored in the database. In addition, certain metadata (e.g., the similarity map used in recommendation systems) is also stored in the database.

Target System: This system is another main component of the platform. If the platform decides to utilize user behavioral data, the target system will run particular algorithms (e.g., an algorithm used to generate recommendations) to process user behavioral data for making the services the platform provides more personalized and more engaging. Note that the outputs of the target system are delivered to users through the aforementioned Server.

Auxiliary Database: Being part of the Evidence Generation System, the auxiliary database is *not* part of the platform. It comprises the data or metadata utilized by the Detector. The database is built through the Web3 community the victim user resorts to.

Detector: When an user thinks that he or she has become a victim, the Detector utilizes the Auxiliary Database to probe the platform and detect whether the user’s ‘stop using my data’ right has been violated. Both the detection logic and the observations obtained by the detector are major evidences the Evidence Generation System will later present to the Judge. In addition, since the victim user is directly benefited by the Detector, we assume that the victim user has strong incentives to run the (lightweight) Detector software on his or her own device. However, it should be noticed that in case the user is dishonest, he or she could manipulate the Detector software. To address this kind of dishonesty, our framework provides the Judge with the capability of re-executing the Director software.

Blockchain: As mentioned earlier, our framework employs the blockchain to address the challenge of lie of the user. The blockchain maintained by each aforementioned Web3 community records the relevant user behavior data (e.g., every service request sent to the platform, every response from the platform, every ‘stop using my data’ request sent to the platform). In order to ensure user privacy, only the hash values of these user behavior data are stored in the

blockchain. The original behavior data are separately kept by each individual user. The blockchain provides the Judge with the following *trustworthy property*: the hash values are immutable. Accordingly, when the Judge later receives any original behavior data from an user, the Judge can leverage the corresponding hash values (stored in the blockchain) and this property to verify that the user did not lie. Note that the hash values (and the corresponding original behavior data) are also major evidences the Evidence Generation System will later present to the Judge.

Since the Auxiliary Database is also owned by the Web3 community, every update of this database must also be recorded in the blockchain. Otherwise, if the Auxiliary Database does not have transparency and immutability, the entire Evidence Generation System may become untrustworthy.

Judge: After the Evidence Generation System sends all the major evidences to the Judge, the Judge will examine the collected evidences and decide if the accused is guilty.

E-commerce illustration of our framework. E-commerce platforms provide users with merchant purchasing services. When our framework is employed to provide such users with better data right protection, the primary ‘stop using my data’ concern is as follows: while the recommendation systems deployed on E-commerce platforms regularly use users’ collective purchase histories (i.e., what is purchased and when) to make recommendations to individual users, each user has the right to ask any E-commerce platform to stop using his or her purchasing activities data when making any recommendations to any users.

In this scenario, the Server in our framework specifically refers to the E-commerce website. The Target System refers to the aforementioned recommendation system. The Database refers to the repository of purchase histories and the similarity map utilized by the recommendation system. Consider a group of users coming together to establish a Web3 community aimed at safeguarding their rights. When Alice (denoted as The Victim User in our framework), One of the community members, suspects that the E-commerce platform still uses her purchase history even after receiving her ‘stop using my data’ request, she will ask the Evidence Generation System, a novel type of system proposed in this paper, to generate convincing evidences of data right violation.

As we will shortly present in Section V, the specific Detector helping E-commerce users will utilize a community-owned similarity map, denoted as Auxiliary Database in our framework, to choose the items to purchase when probing the platform. Moreover, in order to generate the similarity map in a privacy-preserving manner, a standard MPC protocol will be employed by the group of users forming the Web3 community.

B. Multi-party Computation Group

To address the data accessibility challenge we propose the Web3 community that involves aggregating data from multiple users who share similar characteristics. However, this approach raises privacy concerns (e.g. the leakage of data between users), and to mitigate these concerns, we employ multiparty secure computation techniques to protect users’ data.

In our framework, we jointly compute the target algorithm (i.e., the algorithm used by the Target System) over users' private inputs while ensuring the confidentiality of this data. To deal with different target algorithms, our framework may employ different MPC techniques (e.g., homomorphic encryption, oblivious transfer, garbled circuits).

Considering the *collaborative filtering algorithm* in a recommendation system example, which primarily utilizes multiply and add functions, homomorphic encryption emerges as a suitable MPC technique for conducting the necessary calculations. In this scenario, users encrypt their individual data using the CKKS fully homomorphic encryption algorithm (support both add and multiply functions) and collaboratively run the collaborative filtering algorithm on the encrypted data. While maintaining data confidentiality, we can obtain the same results as running the algorithm on cleartext data.

C. Evidence Generation System

The evidence generation system forms the core of our framework. The system includes the auxiliary database, the detector, and the blockchain. The auxiliary database is used to address the **data accessibility** challenge, which is built using the outputs from the MPC group.

The detector algorithm is specifically designed for a particular target system to generate evidences. The *key insight* of Detector is as follows: Through modification of user inputs and monitoring the resultant outputs, we can ascertain whether the target system has leveraged the user's behavioral data. By utilizing the metadata stored in the auxiliary database, the detector can predict the potential outputs for a specific input. Then, the predictions may be used by the Detector to assess the appropriateness of the observed outputs.

To address the **lie of user** challenge, our framework utilizes the blockchain. As mentioned earlier, the blockchain is employed to tackle several types of dishonesty: (a) The user falsely asserted a violation of their data rights as a pretext to seek compensation. (b) The user provides false data to mislead the evidence generation system. (c) The user falsely claimed to have submitted a 'stop using' request to the platform, but actually did not. Because the data (e.g., hash values) stored in the blockchain are immutable, all the data corruption (and deletion) attempts beyond dishonesty will fail.

Although the design of auxiliary databases and blockchains remains largely the same across various (types of) target systems, the design of the Detector may need to be target-system-specific.

V. CASE STUDY: RECOMMENDATION SYSTEMS

Recommendation systems play a vital role in driving user engagement and business performance by delivering personalized recommendations based on user data analysis. These systems exploit user behavior and preferences to generate personalized suggestions. We choose recommendation systems as our case study due to two reasons: 1) they are a most representative type of target systems in our framework; 2) they are widely employed by a variety of Internet-based platforms, holding significant societal implications.

A. Collaborative Filtering Algorithm

Collaborative filtering is a widely-used algorithm in recommendation systems to provide users with personalized recommendations based on their historical preferences and behaviors [31], [32]. It works by analyzing the collective past interactions between users and items (movies, products, books, etc.) and then recommending new items to an user based on the similarities between the items previously-bought by the user and the items outside the user's purchase history. The collaborative filtering algorithm has become an integral component of contemporary recommendation systems due to its widespread application across various industries. Its ability to analyze user preferences and behaviors has made it a go-to solution for businesses in e-commerce, online streaming, social media, and other domains.

For a recommendation system with M users and N items, the rating of user i on item a is defined as $r_{i,a}$. (We assume that user i will rate every item in his or her purchase history.) In accordance with the item-based collaborative filtering algorithm, the item vector is defined as $v_a = \{r_{0,a}, r_{1,a}, \dots, r_{M,a}\}$.

The collaborative filtering algorithm contains three steps: 1) Calculate the similarity between different items, among which $i \in I$ summations are over the users that have rated both the items a and b :

$$s_{a,b} = \frac{\sum_{i \in I} r_{a,i} r_{b,i}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in I} r_{a,i}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I} r_{b,i}^2}}$$

2) Let user i be the target user. For each item a not in the user's purchase history, calculate the "how likely user i will buy this item" score for a as follows. Here, the summations are over all other rated items $b \in H_i$; $s_{b,a}$ is the similarity between b and a ; $r_{i,b}$ is the rating of user i on b .

$$score_{i,a} = \frac{\sum_{b \in H_i} s_{b,a} r_{i,b}}{\sum_{b \in H_i} |s_{i,b}|}$$

3) Sort the scores calculated in the previous step in descending order and obtain the top K highest scores as recommendations for user i .

It is clear that the similarity values between items serve as the basis for generating recommendations. Accordingly, the recommendation system will maintain a unique database called **similarity map**.

The interplay between the "Stop Using My Data" right and the collaborative filtering algorithm is as follows: As soon as the recommendation system receives the "Stop Using My Data" request from Alice, the similarity map should be revised in such a way that all the influence of Alice's purchase history on the similarity map should be removed. In addition, Alice's purchase history should no longer be used when making recommendations to Alice.

B. Evidence Generation System Overview

Figure 3 illustrates how evidences are generated through the interactions between four main components: user, platform (recommendation system), evidence generation system, and a judge. Initially, a user, Alice, purchases items on the platform, which subsequently analyzes her purchase history to generate the recommendations. As a member of the Web3 community, Alice shares both her purchase history and the past recommendations with the evidence generation system. After




Fig. 3. The evidence generation dataflow.

Alice submits a request asking the platform to discontinue the use of her data, the data right violator platform continues to generate new recommendations using her purchase history. As soon as Alice senses data right violation, she shares the new recommendations with the evidence generation system. The system uses a novel probing algorithm, which we will present shortly in next section, to gather the corresponding evidences. As soon as adequate evidences are generated, they will be sent to the Judge. If the evidences suggest that the platform has indeed improperly used the user’s purchase history, the Judge may mandate that the platform provide compensation.

VI. TWO-PHASE EVIDENCE GENERATION PROTOCOL

A. Key Insights




Fig. 4. Amazon Magazine dataset Sparsity.




Fig. 5. Amazon Beauty dataset Sparsity.

Key observation. Figure 4 and Figure 5, obtained through the analysis of the real-world Amazon Magazine dataset and

the Amazon Beauty dataset, respectively, provides a key observation, that is, real-world similarity maps have *high sparsity*. The high sparsity property is manifested by the observation that a considerable portion of items are only ever bought by a limited number of users.

Key insight. The key data sparsity property of real-world similarity maps indicates that although the auxiliary similarity map (i.e., auxiliary database) maintained by the evidence generation system is calculated based on the purchase histories of a limited number of users in the Web3 community, the map may already hold all the similarity relationships for many items included in the map. Consequently, the recommendations derived from the auxiliary similarity map for an item are very likely to be accurate, making them suitable for probing the platform.

B. The Evidence Generation Protocol

Our evidence generation protocol comprises two distinct stages. The two stages answer the following two research questions, respectively.

(Q1) The real similarity map is only partially known to the evidence generation system. How to choose the probing items in such a way that the impact of limited knowledge (about the similarity map) is minimized?

(Q2) How to reason whether the gathered evidences are adequate?

We use the following example to illustrate our protocol:

Running Example

Alice purchases some items on a platform. Her purchase history includes stationery like pencil, eraser, pen and books like Harry Potter. Based on her purchase history, the platform recommends a few other stationery and books to her. To protect her data right, she sends a “Stop Using My Data” request to the platform.

C. Choose the Probing Items

Based on the definition of similarity between items and the aforementioned key observation, we make the following two basic assumptions:

Assumption 6.1: The smaller the similarity (values) between items, the larger the differences (between items) are.

Assumption 6.2: Without knowing the similarity map maintained by the recommendation system, utilization of the auxiliary similarity map enables the evidence generation system to approximately evaluate the similarities between items.

We found that appropriate probing items can be chosen based on several criteria. However, in order to avoid ambiguity in specifying these criteria, two notions must be firstly defined.

Definition 6.1 (per-item-cluster): For each item x bought by a member of the Web3 community, we define the corresponding per-item-cluster based on the following operations.

Initialization. At the inception of the Web3 community, some users already possessed their purchase histories. These histories will be used to calculate the initial auxiliary similarity




Fig. 6. The probing process.

map. Then, for each item x in the auxiliary similarity map, we let the initial per-item-cluster of x include every other item (in the map) that has non-zero similarity between itself and x .

The cluster update operations. We may need to update certain per-item-clusters when an item a is purchased. The update operations will handle two different cases. (Case 1) When a new user makes item a her first purchase, we immediately update the per-item-cluster of a to include all newly recommended items. (Note that if the per-item-cluster does not exist, it will be created with a and all recommended items.) (Case 2) If a is not the buyer’s first purchase, for each item p previously bought by the user, we calculate $sim(a, p)$ and update the corresponding value in the auxiliary similarity map. Then, we will merge the user’s purchase history into the per-item-cluster of a . Next, we will update the per-item-clusters of each item p previously bought by the user. Note that some of these clusters may not contain a . Finally, we will merge the newly recommended items into the per-item-cluster of a .

The cluster growing operations. When an item a is purchased, we not only need to perform the above update operations, but only need to merge the newly recommended items into every per-item-cluster that contains a . Regarding why this merge operation is needed, note that since the auxiliary similarity map differ from the actual similarity map, items may exhibit zero similarity (with a) in the auxiliary map while demonstrating non-zero similarity in the real map due to incomplete set of purchases used in calculating the auxiliary map. In such cases, the real and auxiliary per-item-clusters will differ. This merge operation is performed to let the evidence generation system achieve a better approximation of the black-box target system.

Definition 6.2 (Purchase History Cluster): We amalgamate all the per-item-clusters for each item in the purchase history of user i into an union termed the purchase history cluster of user i .

Classify the users in the Web3 community into two groups. We categorize the users in the Web3 community into two groups, based on the congruence between recommendations derived from the auxiliary similarity map and those from the actual recommendations. We classify the users whose received recommendations for all purchased items are already in the per-item-clusters calculated based on the auxiliary similarity map as belonging to group one, while those experiencing discrepancies fall into second group.

Now we propose the following **criteria for choosing the probing items**: (C1) A chosen item should be the first item purchased by a non-victim user in the Web3 community. (C2) The observed platform recommendations for a chosen item should entirely fall within the item’s auxiliary cluster which is calculated based on the auxiliary similarity map. (C3) The per-item-cluster for a chosen item should contain no item from any growing operations. (C4) The similarity between a chosen item and the items in the victim user’s purchase history should be zero.

For each victim user in the Web3 community, the evidence generation system can obtain her entire purchase history and all the recommendations from the platform. For example, assume Alice’s purchase history is $[a, b]$. We know the recommendations for history $[a]$ and the recommendations for history $[a, b]$. We cannot get the recommendations for history $[b]$ as item a is purchased before b . In this situation, criterion C1 helps to ensure that the recommendation generated based on the auxiliary similarity map is the recommendation provided by the platform. Criteria C2 and C3 guarantee the discrepancy between the auxiliary and the actual clusters is minimal or even nonexistent. Note that it is highly probable, if not certain, that the recommendations for the probing item will fall within the auxiliary cluster. Based on the aforementioned basic assumptions, criterion C4 helps us get a clear difference between the recommendations for the probing item alone and the recommendations for Alice’s purchase history plus the probing item.

Based on the collaborative filtering algorithm, score is calculated by multiplying similarity and ratings, where ratings are directly assigned by users. To make this difference even bigger, we let Alice assign rating value 1.0, which is the highest rating, to the probing item. Note that different rating values will not influence the recommendations for the probing item, but the recommendations for the purchase history plus the probing item will be influenced. The smaller the assigned rating value is, the larger the history vs. no history difference. Using rating value 1.0, this difference would be minimized.

D. Using the probing items to generate adequate evidences

The probing process is illustrated in Figure 6. We answer the second research question Q2 based on the following assumption:

Assumption 6.3: The recommendations from the platform form a cluster (and we assume we know the size of it), but

we only know part of the cluster based on the output of the platform. We denote such clusters as an R cluster. For example, the R cluster size is 10, but each time the recommendation system will randomly choose 7 items as the recommendations.

Answer for Q1

We first employ criterion C1 to identify all the candidate items. Second, we employ criterion C4 to filter off the first set of unqualified items. Third, we employ criterion C3 to filter off the second set of unqualified items. Finally, we employ criterion C2 to filter off the last set of unqualified items.

Although we assume we know the cluster size, the cluster size is sometimes difficult to infer. For example, in real-world platforms like Amazon, recommended products vary with each page refresh or following a re-login. To handle the scenarios in which the evidence generation system cannot know the cluster size, we assume that the Judge is willing to obtain such metadata from the recommendation system.

Considering criterion C4, which stipulates that (the union of) the auxiliary clusters of the items in the victim’s purchase history and the R cluster of the probing item have no intersection, and given the above assumption, which allows us to determine the R cluster size of the probing item, we can draw the following conclusion:

Lemma 6.1: Let’s denote the (set of) disclosed recommendations for a probing item p as set B. Let’s denote the per-item-cluster of p as set A. If the cardinality of $A - B$ exceeds the total number of undisclosed recommendations, it can be concluded that the platform continues utilizing the victim user’s purchase history.

Proof. For this lemma, our “proof by contradiction” is as follows: Let’s assume that the platform had stopped utilizing the victim user’s purchase history. If some recommended items don’t belong to the per-item-cluster of p , this must be due to incomplete knowledge held by the evidence generation system, and therefore such items should be added into the per-item-cluster of p . However, after these items are added, the size of the per-item-cluster would be larger than the known size, which contradicts Assumption 6.3.

Since the observation mentioned in Lemma 6.1 is not guaranteed to be observed through only one probing item, there is usually a need to leverage two or more probing items. In our evaluation experiments (See Section VII), we will measure on average how many probing items are needed.

Besides Lemma 6.1, the following observation may make the evidences more convincing: If the recommendations for the probing item include items from the victim’s purchase history, it is very likely that the platform still uses the victim user’s purchase history.

According to criteria C2 and C4, there is no intersection between the known portions of the cluster for the probing item and the purchase history. Given that the similarity between the probing item and items in the purchase history is zero, the existence of an item that maintains non-zero similarity with both

the probing item and purchase history, yet remains undetected by the Web3 community, is extremely rare. However, under assumption 6.3, since our knowledge of the per-item-cluster of the probing item and the purchase history cluster remains incomplete, we cannot conclude that the possibility (of not using the victim user’s history) is zero.

Remark 1: For a user in group two, the similarity between the user’s purchase history and the probing items may not be zero. So, it is harder for us to get enough evidence as the difference may not be big enough.

Answer for Q2

Whenever the observation described in Lemma 6.1 is observed, we can deduce that the platform continues utilizing Alice’s purchase history.

E. Blockchain Design

In this section, we introduce our current design of blockchain. In blockchain, each user has a public key and a private key. The public key is used to receive transactions, while the private key is used to sign transactions. The public key is visible to anyone, but the private key is kept confidential and known only to the user. Therefore, while transactions can be traced, the true identity of the transaction users remains confidential.

The whole process of the web3 community member contains three steps: 1) Transaction initiation: After a user purchases an item, they create a transaction containing payment information, details of the purchased item, and the transaction time. They use their private key to sign a digital signature, which is then appended to the end of the currency, creating a transaction record. 2) Transaction broadcast: This transaction is broadcasted to the blockchain network. Nodes in the network verify the validity of this account. 3) Smart contract execution: If the transaction is verified as valid, smart contracts on the blockchain update the data, and the transaction is added to a new block on the blockchain. This block is appended to the end of the blockchain, creating a permanent and immutable record.

The smart contract code is as following, we define one structure Transaction, which records the purchase of user and two functions, which are used for recording purchase and getting transaction.

```
pragma solidity ^0.5.16;
contract PurchaseRecord {
    struct Transaction {
        address buyer;
        string itemID;
        uint256 rate;
        uint256 transactionTime;
    }
    Transaction[] public transactions;
    function recordPurchase(string memory
        itemDetails, uint256 paymentAmount)
        public {
        Transaction memory newTransaction =
            Transaction({
                buyer: msg.sender,
```

```

        item: itemID,
        rate: rate,
        transactionTime: now
    }); transactions.push(newTransaction);
}
function getTransaction(uint256 index)
public view returns (address, string
memory, uint256, uint256) {
    Transaction memory transaction =
        transactions[index];
    return (transaction.buyer, transaction
        .itemID, transaction.rate,
        transaction.transactionTime);
}
}

```

The whole process can be easily applied to existing blockchain like Ethereum, by compiling the source code of the smart contract into bytecode then transmitting the bytecode to public nodes.

F. Multi-party Computation

In this section, we explain how we apply multi-party computation into the web3 community. We implement item-based collaborative filtering algorithm in homomorphic encryption to ensure the privacy of user purchases and ratings. We apply Cheon-Kim-Kim-Song (CKKS) as the homomorphic methods. CKKS is a homomorphic encryption scheme known for its ability to perform computations on floating-point operations with low noise growth. However, as CKKS cannot perform square root operations, therefore, we will divide the above section into two parts for the calculation:

Initialization Phase Each user i has a private key sk_i and a public key pk_i generated using a homomorphic encryption scheme. The rating of user i on item a , denoted as $r_{i,a}$, is encrypted as $Enc_{pk_i}(r_{i,a})$ and sent to the server.

Also, as CKKS can not calculate square root operation now.

Similarity Computation Phase The server computes the similarity between different items in an encrypted form. For items a and b , the similarity score $s_{a,b}$ is computed based on ratings that users have given to both items, with the following modification for secure computation:

1) The encrypted similarity score between item a and b is calculated by the server using the homomorphic properties of the encryption scheme:

$$Enc(s_{a,b}) = \frac{\bigoplus_{i \in I} Enc_{pk_i}(r_{i,a}) \otimes Enc_{pk_i}(r_{i,b})}{\sqrt{\bigoplus_{i \in I} (Enc_{pk_i}(r_{i,a}))^2} \cdot \sqrt{\bigoplus_{i \in I} (Enc_{pk_i}(r_{i,b}))^2}},$$

where \oplus denotes homomorphic addition, and \otimes denotes homomorphic multiplication.

2) The server then sends the encrypted similarity score $Enc(s_{a,b})$ to a secure entity capable of decrypting the information or to the users themselves for secure decryption.

Decryption and Normalization Phase Finally, the similarities are decrypted and normalized to be used for generating recommendations.

- 1) The secure entity or users (whoever is responsible for decryption) decrypt $Enc(s_{a,b})$ using their corresponding private keys to obtain the similarity score $s_{a,b}$.
- 2) The decrypted similarity scores can then be used for generating recommendations while ensuring the privacy of $r_{i,a}$ is maintained throughout the computation process.

VII. EVALUATION

Our evaluation experiments will focus on answering the following questions: (Q1) Are the probing items selected by our evidence generation system indeed the ones intended? Since the real similarity map is only partially known to our evidence generation system, the probing items might be mistakenly selected. (Q2) For each user in Group One, how many rounds of probing are needed for the evidence generation system to obtain the platform output that adheres to Lemma 6.1? Note that as soon as such an output is obtained, the Judge can be convinced via the lemma. (Q3) How large is the portion of group one users in a representative Web3 community? Note that group one users are the targets of protection of our evidence generation system.

Besides answering the three questions, we also evaluated the time consumed to compute the auxiliary similarity maps through MPC. Nevertheless, since platform probing is triggered by violations of ‘‘Stop Using My Data’’ and since such violations are usually infrequent, measuring the end-to-end processing time of our evidence generation system is not a major concern of the Web3 communities. Accordingly, we did not measure the processing time of the blockchain in our system.

A. Dataset

We use two real-world datasets, namely Amazon Magazine Dataset and Amazon Beauty Dataset. The Magazine Dataset contains 89,688 (purchasing) records with 72,098 items from 2,428 users and the Beauty dataset contains 371,344 records with 324,038 items from 32,586 users. We illustrate the sparsity of these two datasets by presenting their heat-maps in Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively, where the x-axis represents the users and the y-axis represents the items. The data indicate that both datasets exhibit extremely high levels of sparsity. Specifically, the Amazon Magazine dataset demonstrates a sparsity of 99.997%, whereas the other dataset shows a sparsity of 99.95%.

B. Are the adopted probing items indeed the ones intended?

The selection of probing items is a crucial step, greatly impacting the evidence generation process. We denote every item which meets all of the four criteria (i.e., C1, C2, C3, and C4) presented in Section VI a *target item*. In Section VI, we hypothesize that the recommendations derived from the auxiliary similarity map for target items are very likely to be accurate, making them suitable for probing the platform. In this section, we will test this hypothesis through the following comparison:

- For each of the two real-world datasets we use, we build four representative Web3 communities, holding 2% of users, 5% of users, 10% of users, and 20% of users, respectively.
- We replay the purchasing activities recorded in the real-world dataset and run the Collaborative Filtering Algorithm to construct the real similarity map and use it to generate recommendations.

TABLE I

THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLUSTERS OBTAINED THROUGH AUXILIARY SIMILARITY MAP VS. REAL SIMILARITY MAP OF AMAZON MAGAZINE DATASET.

Size of Web3 Community	2% User		5% User		10% User		20% User	
	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real
Target Item Number	39		92		192		406	
Target Item with Same Clusters	38 (97.4%)		91 (98.9%)		187 (97.4%)		392 (96.6%)	
The Average Size	10.4	56.2	13.0	14.7	15.1	22.4	24.0	46.5
The Average Size of Same Clusters	9.3		13.0		14.8		18.8	

TABLE II

THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLUSTERS OBTAINED THROUGH AUXILIARY SIMILARITY MAP VS. REAL SIMILARITY MAP OF AMAZON BEAUTY DATASET.

Size of Web3 Community	2% User		5% User		10% User		20% User	
	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real	Auxiliary	Real
Target Item Number	526		1323		2676		5466	
Target Item with Same Clusters	505 (96.0%)		1284 (97.1%)		2611 (97.6%)		5353 (97.9%)	
The Average Size	6.1	14.2	6.7	10.6	6.8	13.5	11.4	16.0
The Average Size of Same Clusters	5.7		6.4		6.5		9.4	

TABLE III

THE PERCENTAGE OF PROBING ITEMS WHOSE CLUSTERS ARE TOTALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE VICTIM'S PURCHASE HISTORY CLUSTER.

Size of Web3 Community	2% User	5% User	10% User	20% User
Amazon Magazine	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Amazon Beauty	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- When the purchasing activities are being replayed, we let the evidence generation system of each Web3 community to simultaneously construct each community's auxiliary similarity maps and use the auxiliary maps to maintain all the per-item-clusters for each community. Then we use the four criteria presented in Section VI to identify the target items for each community.
- Assume that an oracle community knows the real similarity map (at any point of time), we let the oracle community use the real map to maintain the per-item clusters for the items purchased by each Web3 community. Then we use the per-item clusters to identify the target items for each Web3 community.
- Now, we can compare the target items identified using the auxiliary similarity maps and the target items identified using the real similarity map. Note that the aforementioned hypothesis would be True if the comparison only reveals minimum differences.

The main evaluation results are as follows. First, in terms of which target items are identified, the results are shown in the top lines of Table I and Table II, respectively. The results show that the same set of target items are identified with or without using the real similarity map. The results also show that the percentage of target items remains stable as the Web3 community expands.

Second, we assess the differences between the pair of per-item clusters for each target item. In Table I and II, we can see the percentage of the target items holding the same pair of

TABLE IV

THE PERCENTAGE OF GROUP ONE USERS OF AMAZON MAGAZINE DATASET.

Size of Web3 Community	2% User	5% User	10% User	20% User
Group One User	39.6%	33.1%	34.7%	33.4%
Minimum Length	1	1	1	1
Maximum Length	12	12	15	15
Average Length	3.4	3.0	2.8	2.8

TABLE V

THE PERCENTAGE OF GROUP ONE USERS OF AMAZON BEAUTY DATASET.

Size of Web3 Community	2% User	5% User	10% User	20% User
Group One User	64.4%	67.4%	68.4%	70.4%
Minimum Length	1	1	1	1
Maximum Length	38	38	38	48
Average Length	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7

clusters is always higher than 96%. The results also show that the size of clusters tends to be small for target items. Third, we measured the percentage of the probing items whose per-item clusters are totally different from the victim's purchase history cluster. As shown in the two tables, the percentages are 100% in all of the four Web3 communities.

C. How many users are in group one?

As mentioned in Section VI, users are divided into two categories: group one users vs. group two users. Since group one users are the targets of protection of our evidence generation system, we measure whether representative Web3 communities have numerous group one users or only a few. Tables IV and V show the proportion of group one users within each Web3 community. The results show that a substantial proportion (ranging from 33.1% to 39.6%) of users are indeed group one users in each Web3 community. In addition, the results show

TABLE VI
THE SUCCESS RATE OF PLATFORM PROBING

Size of Web3 Community	2% User	5% User	10% User	20% User
Successful Rate Magazine	100.0%	100.0%	99.5%	99.7%
Successful Rate Beauty	100.0%	99.9%	99.3%	99.5%

that despite the growth of the Web3 community from 2% to 20% of users, the proportion stays stable.

Tables IV and V also show the length statistics of the purchase histories of group one users. Since longer histories tend to have a higher likelihood of including items with incomplete information in the auxiliary similarity map, it is not very surprising that the histories are usually short.

D. How many group one users can be successfully protected?

We first define the one-round probing success rate as follows: if the next probing item we use is randomly (i.e., uniform distribution) selected from the set of target items, the success rate is defined as the probability that the selected target item will trigger the platform to generate the output that adheres to Lemma 6.1.

In order to measure this probability, for each user in Group One, we treated the user as the victim and evaluated all the target items for the user. Let’s assume there are in total N target items. Let’s assume the number of the target items which trigger the platform to generate the output that adheres to Lemma 6.1 is M . Then the probability is M/N . The results in Table VI show that the one-round probing success rates are exceedingly high, approaching 100%. In case the first round of probing does not succeed, the second round of probing will actually enjoy a higher succeed rate since the two rounds of probing events are independent.

E. The Multi-party Computation

We apply the CKKS homomorphic encryption from Microsoft SEAL to compute the auxiliary similarity map while protecting the privacy of the behavioral data held by each user locally. We compare the times consumed to compute the similarity map with and without MPC. For the Amazon Magazine dataset, we selected 2% of users to represent our Web3 community. The computation time for the similarity map is 8 minutes and 42 seconds without CKKS, and 56 minutes and 44 seconds with CKKS. Regarding why we selected 2% of users, we notice that in real-word scenarios, instead of including all users in a very large Web3 community, such a Web3 community is often built by users with similar purchasing behavior. Therefore, such a Web3 community is usually small.

VIII. DISCUSSION

A. Discussion of Grey-box Assumption

During the construction of our evidence generation system, we make the following assumption: We assume that the Internet-based platform is a grey-box, meaning that the data is largely unknown but the platform functions are known.

This assumption intends to serve two purposes: (a) It enables researchers to capture a primary technical challenge in solving the evidence generation problem. That is, the evidence generation system neither has access to the behavioral data stored in the platform, nor knows which portion of the data is used when responding to a particular user service request. Since (a portion of) the behavioral data is used to compute each response generated by the platform, without the ability to utilize the data, it is very difficult to determine whether a response is violating the “Stop Using My Data” right or not. (b) The assumption captures an important pre-condition for a Web3 community to gain the needed evidence generation ability. That is, even if the Web3 community enables a substantial portion of the behavioral data stored in the platform to become accessible to an evidence generation system with strong privacy and integrity protection, the evidence generation system still needs to know how responses are computed by the platform. Otherwise, it seems that the platform can always deny right violation accusations by the following argument: “Because the evidences are generated based on a different way to compute the response, the evidences are not very relevant to the accusation.”

Regarding whether this assumption is reflecting the real-world, let’s take recommendation systems as an example. On one hand, we found that the algorithm employed by many real-world recommendation systems is indeed based on collaborative filtering. On the other hand, we found that platform functions are sometimes not a white-box. For example, a recommendation system leverages user purchase history and profiles to generate recommendations, employing algorithms that transcend basic collaborative filtering and incorporate the aid of artificial intelligence. In such cases, the assumption indicates a gap between the evidence generation system proposed in this paper and real-world platforms. Nevertheless, we found that this gap can be bridged in a realistic way. First, the Judge has the authority to obtain the platform functions. Second, even if the platform functions stay unknown to the Web3 community, the evidence generation system can let the platform functions running on the Judge side to access the data maintained by the Web3 community. In this way, the evidence generation system does not need to be redesigned.

B. Discussion of Cross-user Scenarios

In this paper, our analysis focuses on scenarios in which the platform utilizes user data to generate recommendations tailored to individual users. However, we note that the system has the potential to utilize user data for recommending to other users as well. We denote such a scenario as “cross-user” scenarios. Even within a single Web3 community, detecting violations of “Stop Using My Data” in cross-user scenarios remains challenging. This difficulty arises since such violations involve data dependencies between two users’ purchase histories. Since the data stored in the platform is largely unknown to the Web3 community, the data dependencies sometimes cannot be fully analyzed. For example, let’s assume that Alice and Bob are members of the Web3 community, but George is not. Without knowing the purchase activities of

George, we may be unable to determine whether Alice's purchase history *indirectly* depends upon Bob's history through George's purchase activities.

IX. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

To the best of our knowledge, this paper introduces the first evidence generation system for protecting the "Stop Using My Data" right. We first present a technical definition of the "Stop Using My Data" right in the context of Internet-based platforms. Then, based on blockchain technology and MPC technology, we propose the first evidence generation framework for potential victims receiving services from Internet-based platforms. The framework has a set of unique characteristics. Towards validating the proposed evidence generation framework, we conduct a case study on recommendation systems with systematic evaluation experiments using two real-world datasets (i.e., the Amazon Magazine dataset and the Amazon Beauty dataset).

In future research, it is imperative to broaden the application of the proposed evidence generation framework. In our future work, we aim to design evidence generation systems not only for e-commerce platforms, but other kinds of platforms such as Gboard, a platform providing various typing services. Furthermore, the current evidence generation system lacks the capability to safeguard one user's data from being leveraged in generating the platform's responses for other users. In our future work, we aim to extend our evidence generation system to handle "cross-user" scenarios.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Sha, T. A. Yang, W. Wei, and S. Davari, "A survey of edge computing-based designs for iot security," *Digital Communications and Networks*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 195–202, 2020.
- [2] R. Mayrhofer, J. V. Stoep, C. Brubaker, and N. Kravich, "The android platform security model," *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1–35, 2021.
- [3] M. Komnienic, "64 alarming data privacy statistics businesses must see in 2024," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://termly.io/resources/articles/data-privacy-statistics/>
- [4] T. Rocha, E. Souto, and K. El-Khatib, "Functionality-based mobile application recommendation system with security and privacy awareness," *Computers & Security*, vol. 97, p. 101972, 2020.
- [5] J. Jung, J. Cho, and B. Lee, "A secure platform for iot devices based on arm platform security architecture," in *2020 14th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication (IMCOM)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–4.
- [6] C. Li, H. Niu, M. Shabaz, and K. Kajal, "Design and implementation of intelligent monitoring system for platform security gate based on wireless communication technology using ml," *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management*, pp. 1–7, 2022.
- [7] R. N. Zaeem and K. S. Barber, "The effect of the gdpr on privacy policies: Recent progress and future promise," *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS)*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2020.
- [8] P. Voigt and A. Von dem Bussche, "The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr)," *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing*, vol. 10, no. 3152676, pp. 10–5555, 2017.
- [9] L. A. Bygrave, "Minding the machine v2. 0: the eu general data protection regulation and automated decision making," *Algorithmic Regulation (Oxford University Press 2019, Forthcoming, University of Oslo Faculty of Law Research Paper No. 2019-01)*, 2019.
- [10] M. Lecuyer, V. Atlidakis, R. Geambasu, D. Hsu, and S. Jana, "Certified robustness to adversarial examples with differential privacy," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 656–672.
- [11] J. Dong, A. Roth, and W. J. Su, "Gaussian differential privacy," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 3–37, 2022.
- [12] A. Alabdulatif, I. Khalil, and X. Yi, "Towards secure big data analytic for cloud-enabled applications with fully homomorphic encryption," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 137, pp. 192–204, 2020.
- [13] M. Das, X. Tao, and J. C. Cheng, "Bim security: A critical review and recommendations using encryption strategy and blockchain," *Automation in construction*, vol. 126, p. 103682, 2021.
- [14] H. Wang, H. Hong, L. Xiong, Z. Qin, and Y. Hong, "L-srr: Local differential privacy for location-based services with staircase randomized response," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 2809–2823.
- [15] S. Wang, X. Luo, Y. Qian, Y. Zhu, K. Chen, Q. Chen, B. Xin, and W. Yang, "Shuffle differential private data aggregation for random population," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 2023.
- [16] E. Politou, E. Alepis, and C. Patsakis, "Forgetting personal data and revoking consent under the gdpr: Challenges and proposed solutions," *Journal of cybersecurity*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. ty001, 2018.
- [17] D. Pelouquin, M. DiMaio, B. Bierer, and M. Barnes, "Disruptive and avoidable: Gdpr challenges to secondary research uses of data," *European Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 697–705, 2020.
- [18] T. Huynh-The, T. R. Gadekallu, W. Wang, G. Yenduri, P. Ranaweera, Q.-V. Pham, D. B. da Costa, and M. Liyanage, "Blockchain for the metaverse: A review," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 2023.
- [19] M. N. M. Bhutta, A. A. Khwaja, A. Nadeem, H. F. Ahmad, M. K. Khan, M. A. Hanif, H. Song, M. Alshamari, and Y. Cao, "A survey on blockchain technology: Evolution, architecture and security," *Ieee Access*, vol. 9, pp. 61 048–61 073, 2021.
- [20] X. Li, P. Jiang, T. Chen, X. Luo, and Q. Wen, "A survey on the security of blockchain systems," *Future generation computer systems*, vol. 107, pp. 841–853, 2020.
- [21] T.-M. Choi and T. Siqin, "Blockchain in logistics and production from blockchain 1.0 to blockchain 5.0: An intra-inter-organizational framework," *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, vol. 160, p. 102653, 2022.
- [22] I. Damgård and Y. Ishai, "Scalable secure multiparty computation," in *Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO 2006: 26th Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 20-24, 2006. Proceedings 26*. Springer, 2006, pp. 501–520.
- [23] N. Alexopoulos, A. Kiayias, R. Talviste, and T. Zacharias, "Mcmix: Anonymous messaging via secure multiparty computation." in *USENIX security symposium*, 2017, pp. 1217–1234.
- [24] A. C. Yao, "Protocols for secure computations," in *23rd annual symposium on foundations of computer science (sfcs 1982)*. IEEE, 1982, pp. 160–164.
- [25] C. Zhao, S. Zhao, M. Zhao, Z. Chen, C.-Z. Gao, H. Li, and Y.-a. Tan, "Secure multi-party computation: theory, practice and applications," *Information Sciences*, vol. 476, pp. 357–372, 2019.
- [26] S. Fan, T. Min, X. Wu, and W. Cai, "Altruistic and profit-oriented: Making sense of roles in web3 community from airdrop perspective," in *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2023, pp. 1–16.
- [27] K. Nabben, "Web3 as 'self-infrastructure': The challenge is how," *Big Data & Society*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 20539517231159002, 2023.
- [28] B. Farahani, F. Firouzi, and M. Luecking, "The convergence of iot and distributed ledger technologies (dlt): Opportunities, challenges, and solutions," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 177, p. 102936, 2021.
- [29] Q. Zhu, S. W. Loke, R. Trujillo-Rasua, F. Jiang, and Y. Xiang, "Applications of distributed ledger technologies to the internet of things: A survey," *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 1–34, 2019.
- [30] W. Zou, D. Lo, P. S. Kochhar, X.-B. D. Le, X. Xia, Y. Feng, Z. Chen, and B. Xu, "Smart contract development: Challenges and opportunities," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 10, pp. 2084–2106, 2019.
- [31] B. Sarwar, G. Karypis, J. Konstan, and J. Riedl, "Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web*, 2001, pp. 285–295.
- [32] G. Linden, B. Smith, and J. York, "Amazon. com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering," *IEEE Internet computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 76–80, 2003.