

# Combining Classical and Probabilistic Independence Reasoning to Verify the Security of Oblivious Algorithms (Extended Version)

Pengbo Yan<sup>1</sup> (✉), Toby Murray<sup>1</sup>, Olga Ohrimenko<sup>1</sup>, Van-Thuan Pham<sup>1</sup>, and Robert Sison<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia  
 pengboy@student.unimelb.edu.au,

{toby.murray, oohrimenko, thuan.pham}@unimelb.edu.au

<sup>2</sup> UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia, r.sison@unsw.edu.au

**Abstract.** We consider the problem of how to verify the security of probabilistic oblivious algorithms formally and systematically. Unfortunately, prior program logics fail to support a number of complexities that feature in the semantics and invariant needed to verify the security of many practical probabilistic oblivious algorithms. We propose an approach based on reasoning over perfectly oblivious approximations, using a program logic that combines both classical Hoare logic reasoning and probabilistic independence reasoning to support all the needed features. We formalise and prove our new logic sound in Isabelle/HOL and apply our approach to formally verify the security of several challenging case studies beyond the reach of prior methods for proving obliviousness.

## 1 Introduction

Side-channel attacks allow attackers to infer sensitive information by eavesdropping on a program’s execution, when the sensitive data are not directly observable (e.g. because they are encrypted). For example, sensitive documents or secret images can be reconstructed by only observing a program’s memory access pattern [19, 24, 28]. Many algorithms are charged with the protection of secrets in application contexts where such attacks are realistic, for example, cloud computing [32, 38], secure processors [8, 25] and multiparty computation [23].

The goal of an oblivious algorithm (e.g. path ORAM [36], Melbourne shuffle [29]) is to hide its secrets from an attacker that can observe memory accesses. Probabilistic oblivious algorithms aim to do so while achieving better performance than deterministic oblivious algorithms. The various programming disciplines to defend against such attacks for deterministic algorithms [1, 26] often lead to poor performance: e.g. to hide the fact that an array is accessed at a certain position, one may have to iterate over the entire array [6]. Probabilistic oblivious algorithms avoid this inefficiency by performing random choices at runtime to hide their secrets from attackers more efficiently. Unfortunately, probabilistic methods for achieving obliviousness are error prone and some have been shown insecure, as a result requiring non-trivial fixes [11, 17].

In this paper we develop a program logic to verify the security of probabilistic oblivious algorithms formally and systematically. We adopt the standard threat model for such programs, in which the attacker is assumed to be able to infer the memory access pattern (e.g. either by explicitly observing memory requests in case of untrusted/compromised operating system or by measuring the time its own memory accesses take due to shared resources like caches) [5, 10, 12, 36].

Although some previous works [4, 7, 35, 37] exist, many oblivious algorithms have complex semantics and invariants that are beyond the reach of those prior methods to reason about. For example, path ORAM [36] maintains an invariant stating that virtual addresses are independent of each other and of the program’s memory access patterns; whereas the oblivious sampling algorithm [32] contains secret- or random-variable-dependent random choices, conditional branches and loops, whose details we introduce in Section 2 and Section 5.

Also, to achieve efficiency, some oblivious algorithms [29, 34, 36] forgo perfection and have a very small probability of failure, which means that they do not perfectly hide their secrets. Fortunately, they are intentionally designed so that the failure probability is bounded by some negligible factor (e.g. of the size of the secret data), meaning that they are secure in practice. Following prior work [29, 36], this means that we can prove them secure by reasoning over perfectly oblivious approximations, the theoretical and perfect version of the practical algorithms that are free of failure by construction (Appendix A.1 justifies this claim). Proving negligible error probability bounds on oblivious algorithms is an important goal, but is out of scope of this present work.

Reasoning over the perfectly oblivious approximations requires an approach that supports for all of the following:

- Assertions that describe probability distributions and independence;
- Reasoning about dynamic random choices over secrets and random variables
  - e.g. a random choice of integers from 1 to random secret variable  $s$ ;
- Reasoning about branches that depend on secret random variables;
- Reasoning over loops that have a random number of iterations.

Our approach that addresses these challenges simultaneously.

Following preliminaries (Section 3), in Section 4 we build a program logic that combines classical and probabilistic reasoning to address the aforementioned challenges, which we prove sound in Isabelle/HOL. Our logic is situated atop the Probabilistic Separation Logic (PSL) [4]; proving the soundness of our logic revealed several oversights in PSL [4], which we fixed (see Section 4.4).

To our knowledge, the reasoning our logic supports is beyond all prior methods for verifying obliviousness, including PSL [4], ObliCheck [35],  $\lambda_{OADT}$  [37], and  $\lambda_{obliv}$  [7]. The combination of classical and probabilistic reasoning also makes our logic more expressive than previous probabilistic Hoare logics (e.g., [13], VPHL [30] and pRHL [3]) which, because they lack assertions for describing distributions and independence, are ill-suited to direct proofs of obliviousness.

Finally, we demonstrate the power of our logic by applying it on pen-and-paper to verify, for the first time, the obliviousness of several non-trivial case

```

Let  $\text{eight}(i) = \{[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}] \mid \forall j. 0 \leq x_j \leq 7\}$ 
Let  $\text{pre} = \{\forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}. S[i] \in \{0, 1\}\}$ 
Let  $\text{inv}(x) = \{\text{Ct}(\text{pre} \wedge i \leq n) \wedge \mathbf{U}_{\text{eight}(x)}[O]\}$ 
synthetic( $S, O, n$ ) :
    {Ct( $\text{pre} \wedge O = []$ )}
1   $A[0] \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,7\}}$ ;
    {Ct( $\text{pre} \wedge O = []$ )  $\wedge \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[0]]$ }
2   $A[1] \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,7\}}$ ;  $i \leftarrow 0$ ;
    {Ct( $\text{pre} \wedge O = [] \wedge i = 0$ )  $\wedge \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[0]] * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1]]$ }
3  while  $i < n$  do                                     because  $\text{eight}(0) = \{\}\}$ 
    { $\text{inv}(i) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[S[i]]] * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]]$ }
4     $O \leftarrow O + A[S[i]]$ ;                               using proposition 1.8
    { $\text{inv}(i+1) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]]$ }
5     $m \leftarrow 8$ ;  $j \leftarrow 0$ ;
    { $\text{inv}(i+1) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]] \wedge \text{Ct}(m = 8 \wedge j = 0)$ }
6    while  $A[S[i]] > j$  do
    {Ct( $m > 7 \wedge m \% 8 = 0$ )}
7     $m \leftarrow m * 2$ ;  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
8    if  $(j + S[i]) \% 3 == 0$  then
9     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
    {Ct( $m > 7 \wedge m \% 8 = 0$ )}using Const rule around the loop
    { $\text{inv}(i+1) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]] \wedge \text{Ct}(m > 7 \wedge m \% 8 = 0)$ }
10    $t \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{1,2,3,\dots,m\}}$ ;                       using RSample
    { $\text{inv}(i+1) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]] \wedge \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[t \% 8]$ }
11    $A[S[i]] \leftarrow t \% 8$ ;                               using Rassign, Unif-Idp rule
    { $\text{inv}(i+1) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[1 - S[i]]] * \mathbf{U}_{\{0\dots7\}}[A[S[i]]]$ }
12    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
    { $\text{inv}(n)$ }
    
```

Fig. 1: Verification of the motivating algorithm.

studies (Section 5). Their verification is a significant achievement in that they constitute the fundamental building blocks for secure oblivious systems.

## 2 Overview

### 2.1 Challenges for verification

Many probabilistic oblivious algorithms use probabilistic independence as a core intermediate condition to prove their obliviousness informally on pen and paper [29, 32, 34, 36], which is intuitive and simple. However, such algorithms present a range of challenges for verifying their obliviousness formally and systematically.

We have constructed the example algorithm in Fig. 1 to illustrate in a simplified form the kinds of complexities that will feature in the semantics and invariants needed to prove our case studies (Section 5). The teal-coloured parts show the verification and will be introduced in the next subsection. Our synthetic algorithm takes an input array  $S$  with size  $n$  containing secret elements:

each either 0 or 1. The list  $O$  is empty initially but will be filled with some data later. We want to prove  $O$  will not leak any information about  $S$ . The synthetic algorithm first initialises an array  $A$  with two random values sampled from the integers between 0 and 7, then it has a nested loop showing the following challenges:

1. The outer loop iterates  $n$  times where the  $i$ th iteration will append  $A[S[i]]$  to  $O$  (line 4). It simulates a simplified version of path ORAM [36], which maintains an invariant that virtual addresses are independent of each other and of the program’s memory access patterns. The secret  $S$  can be seen as a sequence of secret virtual addresses and the output  $O$  represents the memory access pattern. We need to prove an invariant that the elements in  $O$  are independent of each other and independent of each element  $A[S[i]]$  appended to  $O$  by the outer loop. Note: the assignment on line 4 breaks the independence between  $O$  and  $A[S[i]]$ , so lines 4–11 update  $A[S[i]]$  with a fresh random value to re-establish the independence for the next loop iteration. This ensures  $O$  is independent of  $S$  and will not leak secret information.
2. After initialising  $m$  with 8 on line 5, we have the inner loop containing a probabilistic and secret-dependent if-conditional. Its secret dependence makes the control flow different over different values of the secret. The iteration count for the inner loop is truly random, depending on  $A[S[i]]$  (where each iteration doubles  $m$  and increases  $j$  by 1 or 2 depending on whether  $j + S[i] \% 3 = 0$ ). These kinds of loops and conditionals are common in real-world oblivious algorithms (Section 5), yet necessarily complicate reasoning.
3. On line 10, the algorithm makes what we call a dynamic random choice, which is one over a truly random set (here, from 1 to the random variable  $m$ ), assigning the chosen value to  $t$ . Then, (line 11)  $A[S[i]]$  is assigned  $t \% 8$ . This requires reasoning that  $t \% 8$  satisfies the uniform distribution on  $\{0 \dots 7\}$ , because  $m$  is certainly a multiple of 8. Dynamic random choices are also common in real-world oblivious algorithms, as Section 5 demonstrates.

Lines 5 – 11 are derived from the oblivious sampling algorithm [32] (Appendix C.2) to demonstrate challenges 2 and 3.

## 2.2 Mixing Probabilistic and Classical Reasoning

We show how to construct a program logic that combines classical and probabilistic (and independence) reasoning over different parts of the program so that it can verify our running example, as shown in Fig. 1. Namely, certain parts of the algorithm (lines 1, 2, 4, 10) require careful probabilistic reasoning, while others do not, but that each style of reasoning can benefit the other.

Our program logic is constructed by situating these ideas in the context of the Probabilistic Separation Logic (PSL) [4]. PSL is an existing program logic for reasoning about probabilistic programs. PSL employs the separating conjunction (here written  $\star$ ) familiar from separation logic [27] to capture when two probability distributions are independent. In situating our work atop PSL we extend

its assertion forms with the new  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$  assertion, to capture classical information. More importantly, however, we significantly extend the resulting logic with a range of novel reasoning principles for mixing classical and probabilistic reasoning embodied in a suite of new rules (Fig. 3), which we will present more fully in Section 4. These new rules show how classical reasoning (captured by  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$  assertions) can be effectively harnessed, and allow reasoning about dynamic random choices, secret-dependent if-statements, and random loops, making our logic significantly more applicable than PSL; while leveraging PSL’s support for intuitive reasoning about probability distributions makes our logic also more expressive than prior probabilistic program logics [3, 13, 30]. We also harness the close interaction between classical and probabilistic reasoning to allow new ways to prove security (e.g., the UNIF-IDP rule and the final proposition of Proposition 1, which will be introduced in Fig. 3 and Section 4.1), and new ways to reason about random sampling (embodied in the RSAMPLE rule, Fig. 3). Each represents a non-trivial insight, and all are necessary for reasoning about real-world oblivious algorithms (Section 5). The increase in expressiveness, beyond prior probabilistic program logics [3, 4, 13, 30], within a principled and clean extension of PSL attests to the careful design of our logic.

The combination of classical and probabilistic reasoning means that our logic tracks two kinds of atomic assertions, as follows.

**Certain Assertions.** Classical reasoning is supported by certain assertions  $\text{Ct}(e_r)$  that state that some property  $e_r$  (which may mention random variables) is true with absolute certainty, i.e. is true in all memories supported by the current probabilistic state of the program. With certain assertions and classical reasoning, our logic can reason about **loops with random iteration numbers and randomly secret-dependent if statements**. Doing so requires distinguishing classical from distribution (independence) assertions, because the latter are ill-suited for reasoning about random loops and conditionals.

For example, from line 5 to 9, although the random loop and the probabilistic- and secret-dependent if statement complicate the algorithm, we only need classical reasoning to conclude that after the loop  $m$  is certainly a multiple of 8 (using the RLOOP and RCOND rules in Fig. 3, which have the classic form). This information is sufficient to verify the remainder of the algorithm.

**Distribution Assertions.** On the other hand, reasoning about probability distributions is supported by distribution assertions, which we adopt and extend from PSL: for a set expression  $e_d$  (which is allowed to mention non-random program variables),  $\mathbf{U}_{e_d}[e_r]$  states that expression  $e_r$  is uniformly distributed over the set denoted by  $e_d$  in the sense that when  $e_r$  is evaluated in the current probabilistic state of the program it yields a uniform distribution over the evaluation of  $e_d$ . We define these concepts formally later in Section 4.1 (see Definition 2). With this reasoning style, we support **dynamic random choice** (e.g. line 10, the value is sampled from a truly probabilistic set), which is not supported by previous works [3, 4, 7, 13, 30, 35, 37]. Note that we require  $e_d$  to be deterministic here because if  $e_d$  can be probabilistic, then it means a probabilistic expression satisfies a uniform distribution on a probabilistic set—a clear contradiction.

For example, at line 10, even if we do not specify the detailed distribution of  $m$ , we can conclude  $t \% 8$  satisfies the uniform distribution on the set  $\{0 \cdots 7\}$ , as  $m$  is certainly a multiple of 8, by an argument based on our concept of an even partition (Definition 4). This reasoning is supported by our novel `RSAMPLE` rule (Fig. 3). Here, it requires that all the possible sets (in this case,  $\{1 \cdots 8\}$  or  $\{1 \cdots 16\}$  or ...) over which  $t$  was sampled, can each be evenly mapped to (and thus partitioned by) the target set (here  $\{0 \cdots 7\}$ ) by the applied function (here  $\%8$ ). Thus  $t \% 8$  must satisfy the uniform distribution on  $\{0 \cdots 7\}$ .

*Unifying classical and probabilistic independence reasoning* Another important feature of our logic is that it allows independence to be derived by leveraging classical reasoning. For example, considering line 10, 11, if a variable ( $A[S[i]]$ ) always satisfies the same distribution (uniform distribution on  $\{0 \cdots 7\}$ ) over any possible values of some other variables ( $O$  and  $A[1 - S[i]]$ ), then the former is independent of the latter (because  $O$  and  $A[1 - S[i]]$  will not influence the values of  $A[S[i]]$ ). The new rule `UNIF-IDP` (Fig. 3) embodies this reasoning (where  $\star$  denotes independence and  $\mathbf{D}()$  stands for an arbitrary distribution).<sup>3</sup>

Our logic also includes a set of useful propositions (Proposition 1) that aid deriving independence information from classical reasoning.

Returning to the example, with the conclusion that  $A[S[i]]$  is independent of other variables, we can construct the loop invariant of the outer loop ( $\text{inv}(i)$ ) stating that the output array  $O$  always satisfies a uniform distribution following the  $i$ th iteration, which is captured by  $\text{eight}(i)$ . We use the final proposition of Proposition 1 here. Intuitively, this proposition says given a reversible function (whose inputs can be decided by looking at its outputs, e.g. array appending), if its two inputs satisfy uniform distribution and are independent of each other, then the result of the function should satisfy the uniform distribution on the product (by the function) of the two inputs' distribution.

By the invariant, we can conclude finally the output array always satisfies the uniform distribution on  $\text{eight}(n)$ , regardless of secret  $S$ , which means the output will not leak any secret information.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Programming Language and Semantics

In this paper we define a probability distribution over a countable set  $A$  is a function  $\mu : A \rightarrow [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_{a \in A} \mu(a) = 1$ . We write  $\mu(B)$  for  $\sum_{b \in B} \mu(b)$  where  $B$  can be any subset of  $A$  and  $\mathbf{D}(A)$  for the set of all distributions over  $A$ .

The support of a distribution  $\mu$ ,  $\text{supp}(\mu)$ , is the set of all elements whose probability is greater than zero,  $\{a \in A \mid \mu(a) > 0\}$ .

A unit distribution over a single element,  $\text{unit}(a)$ , is  $(\lambda x. \text{if } a = x \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$ . A uniform distribution over a set,  $\text{Unif}_S$ , is  $(\lambda x. \text{if } x \in S \text{ then } 1/|S| \text{ else } 0)$ .

<sup>3</sup> In this case we cannot use PSL's frame rule because  $m$  is not independent of  $A$ .

Given a distribution  $\mu$  over  $A$  and a function  $f$  from elements of  $A$  to a distribution,  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(B)$ , we define  $\text{bind}(\mu, f) = \lambda b. \sum_{a \in A} \mu(a) \cdot f(a)(b)$ , used to give semantics to random selections and assignments to random variables.

Given two distributions  $\mu_A$  and  $\mu_B$  over the sets  $A$  and  $B$ , we define  $\mu_A \otimes \mu_B = \lambda a, b. \mu_A(a) \cdot \mu_B(b)$ . Given a distribution  $\mu$  over  $A \times B$ , we define  $\pi_1(\mu) = \lambda a. \sum_{b \in B} \mu(a, b)$  and  $\pi_2(\mu) = \lambda b. \sum_{a \in A} \mu(a, b)$ . We say these two distributions are independent if and only if  $\mu = \pi_1(\mu) \otimes \pi_2(\mu)$ .

Given a distribution  $\mu$  over some set  $A$ , and  $S \subseteq A$  where  $\mu(S) > 0$ , let  $E \subseteq A$ , we define  $(\mu|S) = \lambda E. \frac{\mu(E \cap S)}{\mu(S)}$ , used to give semantics to conditional statements, as is the following. Given two distribution  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ , and a number  $p \in [0, 1]$ , we define  $\mu_1 \oplus_p \mu_2 = \lambda x. p \cdot \mu_1(x) + (1 - p) \cdot \mu_2(x)$ . When  $p$  is 1 or 0, we unconditionally define the result to be  $\mu_1$  or  $\mu_2$  respectively.

Same as PSL's memory model, we also distinguish deterministic from random variables: only the latter can be influenced by random selections (i.e. by probabilistic choices). We define  $\mathbf{DV}$  as a countable set of deterministic variables and  $\mathbf{RV}$  as a countable set of random variables, disjoint from  $\mathbf{DV}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{Val}$  be the countable set of values, which we assume contains at least the values `true` and `false`. When applying our logic, we will freely assume it contains integers, lists, sets, and any other standard data types as required. Let  $\text{op}$  be a set of operations on values, including binary functions on values of type  $(\mathbf{Val} \times \mathbf{Val}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$ . In practice, we will assume it includes the standard arithmetic, list and set operations, and others as required. Finally, let  $\text{vset}()$  be a function of type  $\mathbf{Val} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Val})$ , taking one value and returning a non-empty, finite set of values, for giving semantics to dynamic random choice.

Then let  $\mathbf{DetM} = \mathbf{DV} \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$  be the set of deterministic memories, and  $\mathbf{RanM} = \mathbf{RV} \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$  the set of random variable memories. A semantic configuration is a pair  $(\sigma, \mu)$ , where  $\sigma \in \mathbf{DetM}$  and  $\mu \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM})$  (a probability distribution over  $\mathbf{RanM}$ ). Configurations represent program states.

As with program variables, we define sets of deterministic and random expressions, denoted  $\mathbf{DE}$  and  $\mathbf{RE}$  respectively.  $\mathbf{DE}$  cannot mention random variables.

**Definition 1 (Expressions).** *Expressions are either deterministic or random, defined as follows:*

*Deterministic expressions:*  $\mathbf{DE} \ni e_d ::= \mathbf{Val} \mid \mathbf{DV} \mid \text{op } \mathbf{DE} \mathbf{DE}$

*Random expressions:*  $\mathbf{RE} \ni e_r ::= \mathbf{Val} \mid \mathbf{DV} \mid \mathbf{RV} \mid \text{op } \mathbf{RE} \mathbf{RE}$

Note that  $\mathbf{DE}$  is a subset of  $\mathbf{RE}$ . Given a deterministic memory  $\sigma$  and a random variable memory  $m$ , we write  $[[e_r]](\sigma, m)$  as the evaluation of expression  $e_r$ . Expression evaluation is entirely standard and its definition is omitted for brevity. The evaluation of deterministic expressions  $e_d$  depends only on the deterministic memory  $\sigma$  and so we often abbreviate it  $[[e_d]]\sigma$ .

Following the distinction between deterministic and random variables, the programming language also distinguishes deterministic and random conditionals and loops. We define two sets of program commands for our language, where  $\mathbf{C}$  is the complete set of commands and  $\mathbf{RC}$  is a subset of  $\mathbf{C}$  containing so-called “random” commands that cannot assign to deterministic variables. We write

**if<sub>D</sub> b then c** to abbreviate **if<sub>D</sub> b then c else skip** and likewise for **if<sub>R</sub> b then c**. As with PSL, our logic is defined for programs that always terminate.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{RC} \ni c ::= \mathbf{skip} \mid \mathbf{RV} \leftarrow \mathbf{RE} \\
\mid \mathbf{RV} \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{RE}} \mid \mathbf{RC}; \mathbf{RC} \\
\mid \mathbf{if}_D \mathbf{DE} \mathbf{then RC} \mathbf{else RC} \\
\mid \mathbf{if}_R \mathbf{RE} \mathbf{then RC} \mathbf{else RC} \\
\mid \mathbf{while}_D \mathbf{DE} \mathbf{do RC} \\
\mid \mathbf{while}_R \mathbf{RE} \mathbf{do RC} \\
\mathbf{C} \ni c ::= \mathbf{skip} \mid \mathbf{DV} \leftarrow \mathbf{DE} \\
\mid \mathbf{RV} \leftarrow \mathbf{RE} \mid \mathbf{RV} \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{RE}} \mid \mathbf{C}; \mathbf{C} \\
\mid \mathbf{if}_D \mathbf{DE} \mathbf{then C} \mathbf{else C} \\
\mid \mathbf{if}_R \mathbf{RE} \mathbf{then RC} \mathbf{else RC} \\
\mid \mathbf{while}_D \mathbf{DE} \mathbf{do C} \\
\mid \mathbf{while}_R \mathbf{RE} \mathbf{do RC}
\end{array}$$

In practical verification, given an algorithm, we try to set all the variables as deterministic variables at the beginning. Then, all the variables sampled from the uniform distribution or assigned by an expression containing random variables must be random variables. All the loop and IF conditions containing random variables must be random loop/IF. All the variables assigned in a random loop/IF must be random variables. We repeat the above process until no variable and loop/IF statements will change their type.

The semantics (Fig. 2) of a command  $c \in \mathbf{C}$  is denoted  $[[c]]$ , which is a configuration transformer of type  $(\mathbf{DetM} \times \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM})) \rightarrow (\mathbf{DetM} \times \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM}))$ . Our programming language extends that of PSL by allowing dynamic random choice, in which a value is chosen from a set denoted by an random expression  $e_r \in \mathbf{RE}$  rather than a constant set. We also add random loops, whose condition can depend on random expressions (rather than only deterministic expressions as in PSL). These improvements increase the expressivity of the language, necessary to capture the kinds of practical oblivious algorithms that we target in Section 5. Unlike PSL, which defines its loop semantics somewhat informally, ours enables

$$\begin{aligned}
[[\mathbf{skip}]](\sigma, \mu) &= (\sigma, \mu) \\
[[x_d \leftarrow e_d]](\sigma, \mu) &= (\sigma[x_d \mapsto [[e_d]]\sigma], \mu) \\
[[x_r \leftarrow e_r]](\sigma, \mu) &= (\sigma, \mathbf{bind}(\mu, m \mapsto \mathbf{unit}(m[x_r \mapsto [[e_r]](\sigma, m))))) \\
[[x_r \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{e_r}]](\sigma, \mu) &= (\sigma, \mathbf{bind}(\mu, m \mapsto \mathbf{bind}(\mathbf{Unif}_{\mathbf{vset}([[e_r]](\sigma, m))}, u \mapsto \mathbf{unit}(m[x_r \mapsto u]))) \\
[[c; c']](\sigma, \mu) &= [[c']]([c])(\sigma, \mu) \\
[[\mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c']](\sigma, \mu) &= \begin{cases} [[c]](\sigma, \mu) & : [[b]]\sigma \neq \mathbf{false} \\ [[c']](\sigma, \mu) & : [[b]]\sigma = \mathbf{false} \end{cases} \\
[[\mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c']](\sigma, \mu) &= [[c]](\sigma, \mu \mid [[b]]\sigma \neq \mathbf{false}) \oplus_{\mu \mid [[b]]\sigma = \mathbf{false}} \\
&\quad [[c']](\sigma, \mu \mid [[b]]\sigma = \mathbf{false}) \\
[[\mathbf{while}_D b \mathbf{do} c]](\sigma, \mu) &= [[\mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} (c; \mathbf{while}_D b \mathbf{do} c)]](\sigma, \mu) \\
[[\mathbf{while}_R b \mathbf{do} c]](\sigma, \mu) &= [[\mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} (c; \mathbf{while}_R b \mathbf{do} c)]](\sigma, \mu)
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 2: Programming Language Semantics

direct mechanisation (in Isabelle/HOL).



## 4 Logic

### 4.1 Assertions

The assertions of our logic include those of PSL, which we extend with the certainty assertion  $\text{Ct}(e_r)$  while extending the uniform distribution assertion  $\mathbf{U}_{e_d}[e_r]$  by allowing the set to be specified by an expression  $e_d$  (rather than a constant as in PSL). The free variables of an expression  $e$  are denoted  $\text{FV}(e)$ . The domain of distribution  $\mu$  over memories, written  $\text{dom}(\mu)$ , is the set of random variables in the memories in the support of  $\mu$ .  $\mathbf{AP}$  denotes the set of atomic assertions.

For a random variable expression  $e_r$ ,  $\text{Ct}(e_r)$  asserts that  $e_r$  evaluates to true in every memory consistent with the current configuration, i.e. it holds with absolute certainty. Note that the set of random variable expressions  $e_r$  can accommodate all standard assertions from classical Hoare logic.

**Definition 2 (Atomic assertion semantics).**

$$\begin{aligned} [[\text{Ct}(e_r)]] &= \{(\sigma, \mu) \mid \forall m \in \text{supp}(\mu). [[e_r]](\sigma, m) = \text{true}\} \\ [[\mathbf{U}_{e_d}[e_r]]] &= \{(\sigma, \mu) \mid \text{FV}(e_r) \cup \text{FV}(e_d) \subseteq \text{dom}(\sigma) \cup \text{dom}(\mu) \\ &\quad \text{and } \text{Unif}_{\text{vset}([[e_d]]\sigma)} = [[e_r]](\sigma, \mu)\} \end{aligned}$$

The assertion  $\mathbf{U}_{e_d}[e_r]$  asserts that the evaluation of random variable expression  $e_r$  yields the uniform distribution over the set denoted by the deterministic expression  $e_d$  when evaluated in the current deterministic memory, where the  $\text{vset}()$  function is used to retrieve that denotation after evaluating  $e_d$  (Section 3.1). We require the expression  $e_d$  to be deterministic as otherwise this assertion can introduce contradictions (e.g. if the set expression instead denoted a truly random set including possible sets  $\{1, 2\}$  and  $\{0\}$ , then  $e_r$  will not be uniformly distributed on any set).

From PSL our logic inherits its other assertions with Kripke resource monoid. The assertions  $\top$  (which holds always),  $\perp$  (which never holds), and connectives  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\rightarrow$  have their standard meaning. The separation logic [27] connectives  $*$  is separating conjunction, here used to assert probabilistic independence; and  $\multimap$  is separating implication. See Appendix A for details.

Note that  $\text{Ct}(P) \wedge \text{Ct}(Q)$  is equivalent to  $\text{Ct}(P \wedge Q)$ , but  $\text{Ct}(a = 1) \vee \text{Ct}(a = 2)$  is different to  $\text{Ct}(a = 1 \vee a = 2)$ : the former asserts that either  $a$  is always 1 or  $a$  is always 2 (stronger); the latter asserts that always  $a$  is either 1 or 2 (weaker).

We also write  $\mathbf{D}(x)$  to abbreviate  $\text{Ct}(x = x)$ , which asserts that the variable  $x$  is in the domain of the partial configuration. Any distribution of  $x$  satisfies this assertion.

Finally, we introduce several useful propositions about assertions implication. They are very useful in the verification and reflect our interplay between classical and probabilistic independence reasoning, especially the last one.

**Proposition 1.**

$$\begin{aligned}
& \models (\phi * \psi) \wedge \eta \rightarrow (\phi \wedge \eta) * \psi, \text{ where } \models \phi \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{FV}(\eta) \cap \mathbf{RV}) & (1) \\
& \models (\phi * \psi) \rightarrow (\phi \wedge \psi) & (2) \\
& \models \mathbf{U}_S[e] \wedge \mathbf{Ct}(f \text{ is a bijection from } S \text{ to } S') \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_{S'}[f(e)] & (3) \\
& \models (\mathbf{Ct}(\phi \wedge \psi)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Ct}(\phi) \wedge \mathbf{Ct}(\psi)) & (4) \\
& \models (\mathbf{Ct}(\phi) \wedge \mathbf{Ct}(\psi)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Ct}(\phi \wedge \psi)) & (5) \\
& \models \mathbf{U}_S[e] \rightarrow \mathbf{Ct}(e \in S) & (6) \\
& \models \mathbf{U}_S[e] \wedge \mathbf{Ct}(e = e') \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_S[e'] & (7) \\
& \models \mathbf{Ct}(x = e \wedge x \notin \mathbf{FV}(e')) \wedge \mathbf{D}(e) * \mathbf{D}(e') \implies \mathbf{D}(x) * \mathbf{D}(e') & (8) \\
& \models \mathbf{Ct}(\forall a, b \in S, c, d \in S'. f(a, c) = f(b, d) \rightarrow a = b \wedge c = d) \wedge \mathbf{U}_S[x] * \mathbf{U}_{S'}[e'] & (9) \\
& \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_{S \times_f S'}[f(x, e')], \text{ where } S \times_f S' = \{f(a, b) \mid a \in S \wedge b \in S'\}
\end{aligned}$$

The first two are inherited from PSL. The third one generalises a similar proposition of PSL [4] over possibly different sets  $S$  and  $S'$ . The fourth and fifth show the equivalence of  $\wedge$  whether inside or outside the certain assertions. The sixth shows the straightforward consequence that if  $e$  is uniformly distributed over set  $S$ , then the value of  $e$  must be in  $S$ . The seventh shows two expressions satisfy the same distribution if they are certainly equal. The eighth shows if we know that  $e$  is independent of  $e'$  and we know another variable  $x = e$  additionally, we can conclude that  $x$  is also independent of  $e'$  if  $x$  is not a free variable in  $e'$ .

The last one also generalises a proposition of PSL [4] by leveraging  $\mathbf{Ct}(\cdot)$  conditions: it restricts binary function  $f$  by requiring it to produce different outputs when given two different pairs of inputs. In practice, we will use this lemma letting  $f$  be the concatenation function on two arrays where  $S$  is a set of possible arrays with the same length. We conclude the concatenated array satisfies the uniform distribution on  $S$  times  $S'$  if those premises hold.

## 4.2 Judgements and Rules

The judgements  $\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\}$  of our program logic are simple Hoare logic correctness statements, in which  $c$  is a program command and  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are preconditions and postconditions respectively.

**Definition 3 (Judgement Validity).** *Given two assertions  $\phi, \psi$  and a program command  $c$ , a judgement  $\{\phi\} c \{\psi\}$  is valid if for all configuration  $(\sigma, \mu)$  satisfying  $(\sigma, \mu) \models \phi$ , we have  $[[c]](\sigma, \mu) \models \psi$ , denoted  $\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\}$ .*

Our logic inherits all of PSL's original rules [4] (See Fig. 5 for details); many of them use the  $\mathbf{Ct}(\cdot)$  assertion to encode equality tests, which were encoded instead in PSL primitively.

Fig. 3 depicts the rules of our logic that embody its new reasoning principles, and support the requirements listed at the end of Section 2.1. The random assignment rule RASSIGN has the classical Hoare logic form. It requires the postcondition  $\phi$  is atomic to avoid unsound derivations, such as  $\{0 = 0 * 0 = 0\} x = 0 \{x = x * x = x\}$ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{RASSIGN} \\
 \frac{\phi \in \mathbf{AP}}{\vdash \{\phi[e_r/x_r]\} x_r \leftarrow e_r \{\phi\}} \\
 \\
 \text{RSAMPLE} \\
 \vdash \{\text{Ct}(\text{El}(f, S, S'))\} x_r \leftarrow_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbf{U}_S \{\mathbf{U}_{S'}[f(x_r)]\} \\
 \\
 \text{RCOND} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\text{Ct}(\phi \wedge b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\text{Ct}(\psi)\} \quad \vdash \{\text{Ct}(\phi \wedge b = \text{false})\} c' \{\text{Ct}(\psi)\}}{\vdash \{\text{Ct}(\phi)\} \text{if}_R b \text{ then } c \text{ else } c' \{\text{Ct}(\psi)\}} \\
 \\
 \text{RLOOP} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi\} \text{if}_R b \text{ then } c \{\phi\}}{\vdash \{\phi\} \text{while}_R b \text{ do } c \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\}} \\
 \\
 \text{UNIF-IDP} \\
 \frac{\text{FV}(a) \cap \text{MV}(c) = \emptyset \quad b \notin \text{FV}(a) \quad \vdash \{\text{Ct}(a \in A) * Q \wedge \text{Ct}(P)\} c \{\mathbf{U}_S[b]\}}{\vdash \{\text{Ct}(a \in A) * Q \wedge \text{Ct}(P)\} c \{\mathbf{D}(a) * \mathbf{U}_S[b]\}}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 3: Rules capturing the interplay of classical and probabilistic reasoning.

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the RSAMPLE rule is another embodiment of the general principle underlying the design of our logic, of classical and probabilistic reasoning enhancing each other. Specifically, it allows us to deduce when a randomly sampled quantity  $f(x_r)$  (a function  $f$  applied to a random variable  $x_r$ ) is uniformly distributed over set  $S'$  when the random variable  $x_r$  was uniformly sampled over set  $S$ . It is especially useful when  $S$  is itself random. It relies on the function  $f$  evenly partitioning the input set  $S$  into  $S'$ , as defined below.

**Definition 4 (Even Partition).** *Given two sets  $S, S'$  and a function  $f$ , we say that  $f$  evenly partitions  $S$  into  $S'$  if and only if  $S' = \{f(s) | s \in S\}$  and there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $\forall s' \in S'. |\{s \in S | f(s) = s'\}| = k$ . In this case we write  $\text{El}(f, S, S')$ .*

RSAMPLE allows reasoning over random choices beyond original PSL [4], and in particular dynamic random sampling from truly random sets. For example, at line 10 of Fig. 1, we have  $\text{Ct}(\text{El}(f, S, S'))$  where  $f = \% 8$ ,  $S = \{0 \dots m\}$ ,  $S' = \{0 \dots 7\}$ . Letting  $k = m/8$  with the above definition, we can prove the precondition implies  $\text{Ct}(\text{El}(f, S, S'))$ . Note that if  $m = 9$  then  $\text{Ct}(\text{El}(f, S, S'))$  will not hold because we cannot find  $k$ . The existence of  $k$  makes sure that  $S$  can be evenly partitioned to  $S'$  by  $f$ . Also, from our new random sample rule RSAMPLE, one can obtain PSL's original rule by letting  $S' = S$  and  $f = (\lambda x. x)$ .

Besides PSL's random conditional rule, we also include the RCOND rule for random conditions that operate over certainty assertions  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$ . It is in many cases more applicable because it does not require the branching condition to be independent of the precondition and, while it reasons only over certainty assertions, other conditions can be added by applying the CONST rule (Fig. 5). The new random loop rule RLOOP is straightforward, requiring proof of the invariant  $\phi$  over a random conditional.

The final new rule UNIF-IDP unifies two methods to prove the independence of an algorithm’s output  $b$  from its input  $a$ : it says that if given any arbitrary distribution of  $a$  we can always prove that the result  $b$  is uniformly distributed, then  $a$  and  $b$  are independent because the distribution of  $a$  does not influence  $b$ , where  $MV(c)$  is the variables  $c$  may write to (same as PSL’s definition). It is useful for programs that consume their secrets by random choice at runtime (e.g. Fig. 1 we verified in Section 2.2 and the Oblivious Sampling algorithm [32] we verify in Appendix C.2).

As an example, we used this rule between line 10 and line 11 in Fig. 1 by letting  $a = (O, A[1 - S[i]])$  and  $P, Q$  be the other information in the assertion before line 10. The first premise of the rule is true because these two lines of code never modify  $O$  and  $A[1 - S[i]]$ . The second premise is also trivially true. The third premise is proved by the RSAMPLE and RASSIGN rules. This yields the conclusion that  $O$  and  $A[1 - S[i]]$  are independent of  $A[S[i]]$ .

Note that the pre-condition  $\text{Ct}(a \in A) * Q \wedge \text{Ct}(P)$  appears in both premise and conclusion of the rule. Considering the WEAK rule (Fig. 5; aka the classical consequence rule), when the precondition is in the premise, we want it be as strong as it can so that the premise is easier to be proved. When it is in conclusion, we want it be as weak as it can so that the conclusion is more useful. These two requirements guide us to design the rule with two free assertions connected by  $\wedge$  and  $*$  respectively so that it is very flexible. If we change the pre-condition to  $\mathbf{D}(a)$  (deleting  $A, P, Q$ ), this rule is still sound (which can be proved by letting  $A$  be the universe set and  $P, Q$  be true) but much less applicable.

### 4.3 Soundness

**Theorem 1.** *All the rules in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, plus the other original PSL rules [4] omitted from Fig. 5, are sound, i.e. are valid according to Definition 3.*

We formalised our logic and proved it sound in Isabelle/HOL (see Supplemental Material). It constitute 7K lines of Isabelle and required approx. 8 person-months to complete. Some of our Isabelle proofs follow PSL’s pen-and-paper proofs but we also found several problems in PSL’s definitions and proofs. We briefly discuss those now, to highlight the value and importance of machine-checked proofs for establishing the soundness of program logics.

### 4.4 Oversights in original PSL

Our machine-checked proofs identified various oversights in the pen-and-paper formalisation of original PSL [4]. We fixed them either by modifying specific definitions or by finding an alternative—often much more complicated, but sound—proof strategy.

PSL [4] defines the notion of when a formula  $\phi$  is supported (**SP**), requiring that for any deterministic memory  $\sigma$ , there exists a distribution over random variable memories  $\mu$  such that if  $(\sigma, \mu') \models \phi$ , then  $\mu \sqsubseteq \mu'$  (meaning that  $\mu$  is a marginal distribution of  $\mu'$  where  $\text{dom}(\mu) \subseteq \text{dom}(\mu')$ ) [4, Definition 6].

This definition aims to restrict the assertions used in PSL’s original rule for random conditionals [4, rule RCOND of Figure 3], but it is not strong enough. All the assertions satisfy it because  $\mu$  can always be instantiated with the unit distribution over the empty memory  $\text{unit}(\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{Val})$ ,  $\sqsubseteq$  all others. This means the second example in their paper [4, Example 2] is a counterexample to their rule for random conditionals because there is not any non-supported assertion.

We fixed this by altering their definition of **SP**. Note that simply excluding the empty memory case is not enough to fix this problem. Instead, we have Definition 5 and our Isabelle proofs ensure its soundness. It does not have a big impact on adjusting the proofs strategy of relevant rules.

**Definition 5 (Supported).** *An assertion  $\phi$  is Supported (**SP**) if for any deterministic memory  $\sigma$ , there exists a randomised memory  $\mu$  such that if  $(\sigma, \mu') \models \phi$ , then  $\mu \sqsubseteq \mu'$  and  $(\sigma, \mu) \models \phi$ .*

Additionally, key lemmas that underpin PSL’s soundness argument turned out to be true, but not for the reasons stated in their proofs [4, Lemmas 1 and 2, Appendix B]. PSL’s Lemma 1 proof has mistakes in the implication case. The second sentence of the implication case said, “there exists a distribution  $\mu''$  such that...”. However  $\mu''$  may not exist because  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  may disagree on some variables in  $\text{FV}(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ . PSL’s Lemma 2 proof also has mistakes. They said “we have  $(\sigma_1, \mu_1) \models \eta$ ” on the third line of proof but this is not true because  $\sigma_1$  may not equal  $\sigma$  (the domain of  $\sigma_1$  could be smaller than  $\sigma$ ). The actual proof of these needs a different strategy which formalized in Isabelle by us.

Without mechanising the soundness of our program logic, it is unlikely we would have uncovered these issues. This shows the vital importance of mechanised soundness proofs.

## 5 Case Studies

We applied our program logic to verify the obliviousness of four non-trivial oblivious algorithms: the Melbourne Shuffle [29], Oblivious Sampling [32], Path ORAM [36] and Path Oblivious Heap [34]. The details are in Appendix C.

While these proofs are manual, each took less than a person-day to complete, except for Path Oblivious Heap, which took approx. 2 days of proof effort.

To our knowledge, the Melbourne Shuffle, Oblivious Sampling, and Path Oblivious Heap have never been formally verified as each requires the combination of features that our approach uniquely supports. Path ORAM has received some formal verification [20, 31] (see later in Section 6) and also comes with an informal but rigorous proof of security [36]. We verified it to show that our logic can indeed encode existing rigorous security arguments.

In practice we need to distinguish the public memory locations and private locations where we assume any access to public memory locations is visible to attackers. So we will add ghost codes to record all those access in an array “Trace” and finally we aim to prove the array is independent of secrets.

The Melbourne Shuffle [29] (see Appendix C.1) is an effective oblivious shuffling algorithm used in cloud storage and also a basic building block for other higher-level algorithms (e.g. oblivious sampling [32]). Its operation is non-trivial, including re-arranging array elements with dummy values and other complexities. Its verification makes heavy use of classical reasoning because, while it is probabilistic, its memory access pattern is deterministic in the absence of failure.

Oblivious sampling [32] (see Appendix C.2) is another important building block having applications in differential privacy, oblivious data analysis and machine learning. The algorithm obliviously samples from a data set, by producing a uniformly-distributed memory access pattern, and includes random and secret-dependent looping and if-statements, plus dynamic random choices (shuffling on a truly probabilistic array). Thus the interplay between classical and probabilistic reasoning that our logic provides is essential to verifying its security.

Path ORAM [36] (see Appendix C.3) is a seminal oblivious RAM algorithm with practical efficiency, providing general-purpose oblivious storage. Path oblivious heap (Appendix C.4) is inspired by Path ORAM and the two share the same idea: using a binary tree with a random and virtual location table to store secret data, where the mappings between each physical and virtual location are always independent of each other and of the memory access pattern. Thus probabilistic independence is crucial to express and prove these algorithms' key invariants.

## 6 Related Work

Our program logic naturally extends PSL [4] non-trivially, including support for classical reasoning, dynamic random choice, improved support for random conditionals, random loops, and random assignments. Our mechanisation of PSL identified and fixed a number of soundness issues (see Section 4.4).

Its unique synergy of classical and probabilistic independence reasoning means our program logic is more expressive not only than PSL but also prior probabilistic Hoare logics, such as [13], VPHL [30] and EasyCrypt's pRHL [3].

Probabilistic coupling (supported by pRHL and EasyCrypt [3]) is another popular way for proving the security of probabilistic algorithms. It does so by proving the output distribution is equal between any pair of different secret inputs, witnessed by a bijection probabilistic coupling for each probabilistic choice. However, for dynamic random choice, the bijection probabilistic coupling may not exist or may even be undefined (e.g. Fig. 1 and [32]). Sometimes, finding the correct coupling can be far more challenging than proving the conclusion directly via probabilistic independence. Indeed, the original informal security proofs of our case studies [29, 32, 34, 36] all use probabilistic independence to argue their obliviousness, instead of coupling.

Other program logics or type systems for verifying obliviousness also exist. For example, ObliCheck [35] and  $\lambda_{\text{OADT}}$  [37] can be used to check or prove obliviousness but only for deterministic algorithms.  $\lambda_{\text{obliv}}$  [7] is a type system for a functional language for proving obliviousness of probabilistic algorithms but it forbids branching on secrets, which is prevalent in many oblivious algorithms

including those we consider in Section 5. It also forbids outputting a probabilistic value (and all other values influenced by it) more than once. Our approach suffers no such restriction.

Path ORAM has received some verification attention [20, 31]. [31] reason about this algorithm but in a non-probabilistic model, instead representing it as a nondeterministic transition system, and apply model counting to prove a security property about it. Their property says that for any observable output, there is a sufficient number of inputs to hide which particular input would have produced that output. This specification seems about the best that can be achieved for a nondeterministic model of the algorithm, but would also hold for an implementation that used biased choices (which would necessarily reveal too much of the input). Ours instead says that for each input the output is identically distributed, and would not be satisfied for such a hypothetical implementation. Nonetheless, it would be interesting to compare the strengths and weaknesses of their complementary approach to ours. [20] recently proposed to verify this algorithm in Coq, but as far as we are aware ours is the first verification of Path ORAM via a probabilistic program logic.

Other recent work extends PSL in different ways. One [18] extended PSL to computational security, but it cannot deal with loops (neither deterministic nor probabilistic) so their target algorithms are very different to ours. Lilac [21] also uses separating conjunction to model probabilistic independence. Crucially, it supports reasoning about conditional probability and conditional independence; [22] validated the design decisions of Lilac. However, Lilac’s programming language is functional whereas ours is imperative; Lilac does not support random loops or dynamic random choice, which are essential for our aim.

IVL [33] reasons about probabilistic programs with nondeterminism. In doing so it supports classical reasoning (e.g. for the nondeterministic parts) and probabilistic reasoning for the probabilistic parts. Our logic reasons only about probabilistic programs (with no nondeterminism) but allows using classical reasoning to reason about parts of the probabilistic program, and for the classical and probabilistic reasoning styles to interact and enhance each other.

## 7 Conclusion and Future Work

We presented the first program logic that, to our knowledge, is able to verify the obliviousness of real-world foundational probabilistic oblivious algorithms whose implementations combine challenging features like dynamic random choice and secret- and random-variable-dependent control flow. Our logic harnesses the interplay between classical and probabilistic reasoning, is situated atop PSL [4], and proved sound in Isabelle/HOL. We applied it to several challenging case studies, beyond the reach of prior approaches.

## References

1. Almeida, J.B., Barbosa, M., Barthe, G., Dupressoir, F., Emmi, M.: Verifying constant-time implementations. In: USENIX Security Symposium. vol. 16, pp. 53–

- 70 (2016)
2. Alvim, M.S., Chatzikokolakis, K., McIver, A., Morgan, C., Palamidessi, C., Smith, G.: *The Science of Quantitative Information Flow*. Springer (2020)
  3. Barthe, G., Dupressoir, F., Grégoire, B., Kunz, C., Schmidt, B., Strub, P.Y.: Easycrypt: A tutorial. *Foundations of Security Analysis and Design VII: FOSAD 2012/2013 Tutorial Lectures* pp. 146–166 (2014)
  4. Barthe, G., Hsu, J., Liao, K.: A probabilistic separation logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **4**(POPL) (dec 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371123>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371123>
  5. Bittau, A., Erlingsson, U., Maniatis, P., Mironov, I., Raghunathan, A., Lie, D., Rudominer, M., Kode, U., Tinnes, J., Seefeld, B.: Prochlo: Strong privacy for analytics in the crowd. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. p. 441–459. SOSP '17, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132769>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132769>
  6. Cauligi, S., Soeller, G., Johannsmeyer, B., Brown, F., Wahby, R.S., Renner, J., Grégoire, B., Barthe, G., Jhala, R., Stefan, D.: Fact: a dsl for timing-sensitive computation. In: *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. pp. 174–189 (2019)
  7. Darais, D., Sweet, I., Liu, C., Hicks, M.: A language for probabilistically oblivious computation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **4**(POPL) (dec 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371118>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371118>
  8. Fletcher, C.W., Ren, L., Kwon, A., van Dijk, M., Stefanov, E., Devadas, S.: RAW path ORAM: A low-latency, low-area hardware ORAM controller with integrity verification. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.* p. 431 (2014), <http://eprint.iacr.org/2014/431>
  9. Galmiche, D., Méry, D., Pym, D.: The semantics of BI and resource tableaux. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **15**(6), 1033–1088 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129505004858>
  10. Goldreich, O., Ostrovsky, R.: Software protection and simulation on oblivious RAMs. *J. ACM* **43**(3), 431–473 (may 1996). <https://doi.org/10.1145/233551.233553>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/233551.233553>
  11. Goodrich, M.T., Mitzenmacher, M.: Privacy-preserving access of outsourced data via oblivious RAM simulation. In: Aceto, L., Henzinger, M., Sgall, J. (eds.) *Automata, Languages and Programming*. pp. 576–587. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2011)
  12. Gruss, D., Spreitzer, R., Mangard, S.: Cache template attacks: Automating attacks on inclusive Last-Level caches. In: *24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*. pp. 897–912. USENIX Association, Washington, D.C. (Aug 2015), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity15/technical-sessions/presentation/gruss>
  13. den Hartog, J.I.: Verifying probabilistic programs using a hoare like logic. In: Thiagarajan, P.S., Yap, R. (eds.) *Advances in Computing Science — ASIAN'99*. pp. 113–125. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1999)
  14. Hoare, C.A.R.: An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Commun. ACM* **12**(10), 576–580 (oct 1969). <https://doi.org/10.1145/363235.363259>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/363235.363259>
  15. Hsu, J.: Probabilistic couplings for probabilistic reasoning. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania (2017)
  16. Katz, J., Lindell, Y.: *Introduction to Modern Cryptography Second Edition*. Chapman, Hall/CRC, 2nd edn. (2014)



17. Kushilevitz, E., Lu, S., Ostrovsky, R.: On the (in)security of hash-based oblivious ram and a new balancing scheme. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. pp. 143–156. SODA '12, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, USA (2012)
18. Lago, U.D., Davoli, D., Kapron, B.M.: On separation logic, computational independence, and pseudorandomness (extended version) (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.11987>
19. Lee, S., Shih, M.W., Gera, P., Kim, T., Kim, H., Peinado, M.: Inferring fine-grained control flow inside SGX enclaves with branch shadowing. In: 26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17). pp. 557–574. USENIX Association, Vancouver, BC (Aug 2017), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity17/technical-sessions/presentation/lee-sangho>
20. Leung, H., Ringer, T., Fletcher, C.W.: Towards formally verified path oram in coq (2023), available online: <https://dependenttyp.es/pdf/oramproposal.pdf>
21. Li, J.M., Ahmed, A., Holtzen, S.: Lilac: A modal separation logic for conditional probability. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. 7(PLDI) (jun 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591226>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591226>
22. Li, J.M., Aytac, J., Johnson-Freyd, P., Ahmed, A., Holtzen, S.: A nominal approach to probabilistic separation logic. In: Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. LICS '24, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661814.3662135>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661814.3662135>
23. Liu, C., Wang, X.S., Nayak, K., Huang, Y., Shi, E.: Oblivm: A programming framework for secure computation. In: 2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 359–376 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2015.29>
24. Liu, F., Yarom, Y., Ge, Q., Heiser, G., Lee, R.B.: Last-level cache side-channel attacks are practical. In: 2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 605–622 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2015.43>
25. Maas, M., Love, E., Stefanov, E., Tiwari, M., Shi, E., Asanovic, K., Kubiatowicz, J., Song, D.: Phantom: practical oblivious computation in a secure processor. In: Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security. p. 311–324. CCS '13, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2508859.2516692>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2508859.2516692>
26. Molnar, D., Piotrowski, M., Schultz, D., Wagner, D.: The program counter security model: Automatic detection and removal of control-flow side channel attacks. In: Information Security and Cryptology-ICISC 2005: 8th International Conference, Seoul, Korea, December 1-2, 2005, Revised Selected Papers 8. pp. 156–168. Springer (2006)
27. O’Hearn, P., Reynolds, J., Yang, H.: Local reasoning about programs that alter data structures. In: Fribourg, L. (ed.) Computer Science Logic. pp. 1–19. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2001)
28. Ohrimenko, O., Costa, M., Fournet, C., Gkantsidis, C., Kohlweiss, M., Sharma, D.: Observing and preventing leakage in mapreduce. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. p. 1570–1581. CCS '15, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2810103.2813695>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2810103.2813695>

29. Ohrimenko, O., Goodrich, M.T., Tamassia, R., Upfal, E.: The melbourne shuffle: Improving oblivious storage in the cloud. In: Esparza, J., Fraigniaud, P., Husfeldt, T., Koutsoupias, E. (eds.) *Automata, Languages, and Programming*. pp. 556–567. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2014)
30. Rand, R., Zdancewic, S.: Vphl: A verified partial-correctness logic for probabilistic programs. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **319**, 351–367 (12 2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2015.12.021>
31. Sahai, S., Subramanyan, P., Sinha, R.: Verification of quantitative hyperproperties using trace enumeration relations. In: *Computer Aided Verification: 32nd International Conference, CAV 2020, Los Angeles, CA, USA, July 21–24, 2020, Proceedings, Part I* 32. pp. 201–224. Springer (2020)
32. Sasy, S., Ohrimenko, O.: Oblivious sampling algorithms for private data analysis. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA (2019)
33. Schröder, P., Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.P., Matheja, C.: A deductive verification infrastructure for probabilistic programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **7**(OOPSLA2) (oct 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3622870>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3622870>
34. Shi, E.: Path oblivious heap: Optimal and practical oblivious priority queue. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Paper 2019/274 (2019), <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/274>, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/274>
35. Son, J., Prechter, G., Poddar, R., Popa, R.A., Sen, K.: ObliCheck: Efficient verification of oblivious algorithms with unobservable state. In: *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. pp. 2219–2236. USENIX Association (Aug 2021), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/son>
36. Stefanov, E., Dijk, M.V., Shi, E., Chan, T.H.H., Fletcher, C., Ren, L., Yu, X., Devadas, S.: Path oram: An extremely simple oblivious ram protocol. *J. ACM* **65**(4) (apr 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3177872>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3177872>
37. Ye, Q., Delaware, B.: Oblivious algebraic data types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **6**(POPL) (jan 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498713>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498713>
38. Zheng, W., Dave, A., Beekman, J.G., Popa, R.A., Gonzalez, J.E., Stoica, I.: Opaque: An oblivious and encrypted distributed analytics platform. In: *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17)*. pp. 283–298. USENIX Association, Boston, MA (Mar 2017), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi17/technical-sessions/presentation/zheng>

## A Ancillary Definitions

Here we spell out in detail how our programming language and assertion semantics, for those inherited from PSL, is defined. These definitions follow those from PSL [4]. The difference has been introduced in Section 3 and Section 4.

### A.1 Security Definition and Verification by Approximation

As we said, many oblivious algorithms have a very small failure probability. Now we state the formal security property that we target, known in this paper

as  $\epsilon$ -Statistical Secrecy, and the process connecting it with our logic. Our security definition is familiar from standard cryptographic security definitions [16]. It is a straightforward relaxation of the following observation. Suppose we have an algorithm that operates over a secret but whose output reveals nothing about that secret. Without loss of generality assume the secret is a single bit: either 0 or 1. Then, assuming the secret is chosen uniformly (i.e. with equal probability) over  $\{0, 1\}$ , an attacker who is only able to observe the output of this algorithm can guess the value of the secret correctly with probability no more than  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Statistical secrecy relaxes this to allow the attacker a small margin of advantage,  $\epsilon$ , permitting them to guess correctly with probability at most  $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ .

**Definition 6 ( $\epsilon$ -Statistical Secrecy).** *Suppose a probabilistic algorithm  $f$  accepts some secret data  $S$  as input and produces some information  $f(S)$  which can be observed by some attacker. We say  $f$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -statistical secrecy if and only if for any two different secrets  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , if we choose  $S$  from the uniform distribution on  $\{S_1, S_2\}$  and then reveal  $f(S)$  to the attacker, then the attacker's probability of correctly guessing whether  $S$  was  $S_1$  or  $S_2$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ .*

We note that this property is an instance of a quantitative information flow (QIF) [2] guarantee about the algorithm against an attacker whose prior over the secret is uniform and who is modelled by the gain function in which a correct guess of the secret is assigned the value 1 and an incorrect guess the value 0, guaranteeing that the change in the attacker's gain is at most  $\epsilon$ .

The security of oblivious algorithms can be expressed as a simple instance of  $\epsilon$ -statistical security relative to an attacker that can directly observe the memory access pattern, as follows.

**Definition 7 (Obliviousness).** *Suppose an algorithm  $f$  takes some secret data  $S$  and produces some memory access pattern  $f(S)$ . We say  $f$  is oblivious iff for any two different secrets  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  with the same length  $n$ , if we choose  $S$  from the uniform distribution on  $\{S_1, S_2\}$  and then reveal  $f(S)$ , then the attacker has no greater than probability  $1/2 + g(n)$  to guess the value of  $S$  correctly, where  $g(n)$  is a negligible function of  $n$ .*

Our approach to proving statistical secrecy is inspired by informal proofs of obliviousness for existing algorithms [29, 32, 34, 36], in which reasoning proceeds by “factoring out” the sources of imperfection in the algorithm to consider an implicitly perfect, hypothetical version of the algorithm. Reasoning proceeds by arguing rigorously but informally that the hypothetical version is perfectly oblivious and, therefore, that the original algorithm is oblivious. This last step is performed by quantifying the difference between the original imperfect algorithm and the hypothetical perfect version and using this distance to bound the degree of imperfection and to argue that it is indeed negligible. The measure of difference used is Statistical Distance (sometimes called Total Variation Distance [15]).

**Definition 8 (Statistical Distance).** *Given two distributions  $p$  and  $q$  over the same sample space  $S$ , we write the statistical distance (also called total variation distance) between  $p$  and  $q$  as  $\text{SD}(p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in S} |p(s) - q(s)|$*

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose there is a distribution  $D$  and an algorithm  $f$  such that for any input  $S$ , the statistical distance between  $f(S)$  and  $D$  is smaller or equal to  $\epsilon$ , then  $f$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -statistical secrecy.*

This lemma is a well-known fact and its proof is relegated to Appendix B.

Thus our approach to verifying an imperfect oblivious algorithm is to build a perfectly oblivious approximation, such that for all inputs the statistical distance between the two is bounded by a negligible amount, then we use our logic to verify that the perfectly oblivious approximation leak no information.

## A.2 Assertions

**Definition 9 (Assertions).** *Assertions,  $\phi, \psi$  etc. are defined as:*

$\phi, \psi ::= p \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \phi \wedge \psi \mid \phi \vee \psi \mid \phi \rightarrow \psi \mid \phi * \psi \mid \phi \dashv * \psi$   
 where  $\mathbf{AP} \ni p ::= \text{Ct}(e_r) \mid \mathbf{U}_{e_d}[e_r]$

Assertion's semantics is given via a partial Kripke resource monoid [9].

**Definition 10 (Kripke resource monoid [9]).**

*A (partial) Kripke resource monoid consists of a set  $M$ , a partial binary operation  $\circ : M \times M \rightarrow M$ , an element  $e \in M$ , and a pre-order  $\sqsubseteq$  on  $M$  such that:*

- $e$  is the identity, namely  $\forall x \in M. x = e \circ x = x \circ e$*
- $\circ$  is associative: namely  $x \circ (y \circ z) = (x \circ y) \circ z$  (both sides can be undefined)*
- $\circ$  is compatible with the pre-order: namely  $x \circ x' \sqsubseteq y \circ y'$  if both sides are defined,  $x \sqsubseteq y$ , and  $x' \sqsubseteq y'$*

As in PSL [4],  $M$  is instantiated to be the set of all partial memories,  $e$  is the empty memory,  $\circ$  combines two disjoint memories, and  $m \sqsubseteq m'$  means  $m$  is a sub-memory of  $m'$ . We write  $(m \circ m') \downarrow$  to say  $(m \circ m')$  is defined.

For any  $S \subseteq \mathbf{RV}$ , the set of all corresponding memories is denoted  $\mathbf{RanM}(S) = S \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$ . Moreover, for any  $\mu \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM}(S))$ , the domain of  $\mu$ , written  $\text{dom}(\mu)$ , is  $S$ .

The empty memory (whether deterministic or random) is defined as  $\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$ .

Given two disjoint sets  $S, S' \subseteq \mathbf{RV}$  and two distributions of memories over them,  $\mu_S \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM}(S))$  and  $\mu_{S'} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM}(S'))$ , we define the product of these two distributions:  $\mu_S \otimes \mu_{S'} = \lambda m. \mu_S(p_S(m)) \cdot \mu_{S'}(p_{S'}(m))$ , where  $m$  is a memory (of type  $\mathbf{RV} \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}$ ), and  $p_S(m)$  returns the sub-map of  $m$  over  $S$ . For any  $v \notin S$ ,  $p_S(m)(v)$  is undefined.

Given  $S' \subseteq S$  and a distribution  $\mu$  over  $S$ , we define  $\pi_{S,S'}$  to yield the distribution over  $S'$  (the smaller domain),  $\pi_{S,S'}(\mu) = \lambda m'. \sum_{m \in \{m \mid p_{S'}(m) = m'\}} \mu(m)$ , where  $p_{S'}(m)$  takes the sub-map of  $m$  over  $S'$ . For example, let  $S = \{x, y, z\}$ , and  $S' = \{x\}$ , let  $\mu$  be a distribution over  $S$  talking about the distribution of the values of those 3 variables, then  $\pi_{S,S'}(\mu)$  is the corresponding distribution of the value of variable  $x$ . We will omit  $S$  later because it is always  $\text{dom}(\mu)$ .

When we evaluate expressions on partial memories, the results may be undefined if some variables in the expression are not in the domain of the partial memories.

**Definition 11 (Instantiating Kripke resource monoid).**

$M$  is the set of partial configurations  $\mathbf{DetM}[S] \times \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{RanM}[T])$ , where  $S$  and  $T$  are subsets of  $\mathbf{DV}$  and  $\mathbf{RV}$  respectively.

$$e = (\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}, \text{unit}(\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{Val}))$$

$$(\sigma, \mu) \circ (\sigma', \mu') = \begin{cases} (\sigma \cup \sigma', \mu \otimes \mu') & : \sigma = \sigma' \text{ on } \text{dom}(\sigma) \cap \text{dom}(\sigma') \\ & \text{and } \text{dom}(\mu) \cap \text{dom}(\mu') = \emptyset \\ \text{undefined} & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$(\sigma, \mu) \sqsubseteq (\sigma', \mu') \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \text{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{dom}(\sigma') \text{ and } \sigma = \sigma' \text{ on } \text{dom}(\sigma) \\ \text{dom}(\mu) \subseteq \text{dom}(\mu') \text{ and } \mu = \pi_{\text{dom}(\mu)}(\mu') \end{cases}$$

Given these definitions,  $(M, \circ, e, \sqsubseteq)$  is a Kripke resource monoid.

Let  $m \models \phi$  denote when partial configuration  $m$  satisfies assertion  $\phi$ . Then the assertion semantics is defined as follows [4].

**Definition 12 (Assertion Semantics).**

For any set  $\mathbf{AP}$  of atomic assertions, an interpretation function  $[[[-]] : \mathbf{AP} \rightarrow 2^M$ , and a Kripke resource monoid  $(M, \circ, e, \sqsubseteq)$  such that if  $m \in [[p]]$  and  $m \sqsubseteq m'$ , then  $m' \in [[p]]$ , the semantics of non-atomic proposition assertions is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} m \models p & \text{iff } m \in [[p]] \\ m \models \top & \text{always} \\ m \models \perp & \text{never} \\ m \models \phi \wedge \psi & \text{iff } m \models \phi \text{ and } m \models \psi \\ m \models \phi \vee \psi & \text{iff } m \models \phi \text{ or } m \models \psi \\ m \models \phi \rightarrow \psi & \text{iff for all } m \sqsubseteq m', m' \models \phi \text{ implies } m' \models \psi \\ m \models \phi * \psi & \text{iff exist } m_1, m_2. (m_1 \circ m_2) \downarrow \text{ and } m_1 \circ m_2 \sqsubseteq m \\ & \text{and } m_1 \models \phi \text{ and } m_2 \models \psi \\ m \models \phi \multimap \psi & \text{iff for all } m' \models \phi, (m \circ m') \downarrow \text{ implies } m \circ m' \models \psi \end{array}$$

All assertions satisfy the Kripke monotonicity property: if  $m \models \phi$  and  $m \sqsubseteq m'$ , then  $m' \models \phi$ . We write  $\models \phi$  when  $\phi$  holds in all partial configurations.

**A.3 Inherited Rules and Auxiliary Functions**

Fig. 4 defines the straightforward auxiliary functions for computing sets of variables read/modified by a command. Fig. 5 shows rules inherited from PSL [4]; many of them use the  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$  assertion to encode equality tests, which were encoded instead in PSL primitively.

**B Omitted Proofs**

This proof of Lemma 1 appears in Fig. 6.

$$\begin{aligned}
RV(x_r \leftarrow e) &= FV(e) & RV(x_r \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_e) &= FV(e) & RV(\mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= \\
&& RV(c) \cup RV(c') && RV(\mathbf{while}_D b \mathbf{do} c) &= RV(c) \\
RV(c; c') &= RV(c) \cup (RV(c') - WV(c)) & RV(\mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= \\
&& RV(c) \cup RV(c') \cup FV(b) && RV(\mathbf{while}_R b \mathbf{do} c) &= RV(c) \cup FV(b)
\end{aligned}$$


---

$$\begin{aligned}
WV(c; c') &= WV(c) \cup (WV(c') - RV(c)) & WV(\mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= WV(c) \cap WV(c') \\
WV(x_r \leftarrow e) &= \{x_r\} - FV(e) & WV(x_r \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_e) &= \\
&& \{x_r\} - FV(e) && WV(\mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= (WV(c) \cap WV(c')) - FV(b)
\end{aligned}$$


---

$$\begin{aligned}
MV(x_d \leftarrow e) &= \{x_d\} & MV(c; c') &= MV(c) \cup MV(c') & MV(\mathbf{while}_D b \mathbf{do} c) &= \\
&& MV(c) && MV(\mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= MV(c) \cup MV(c') \\
MV(x_r \leftarrow e) &= \{x_r\} & MV(x_r \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_e) &= \{x_r\} & MV(\mathbf{while}_R b \mathbf{do} c) &= \\
&& MV(c) && MV(\mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c') &= MV(c) \cup MV(c')
\end{aligned}$$


---

Fig. 4: Auxiliary Functions for Rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{DASSIGN} \quad \text{SKIP} \quad \text{SEQN} \\
 \frac{}{\vdash \{\phi[e_d/x_d]\} x_d \leftarrow e_d \{\phi\}} \quad \frac{}{\vdash \{\phi\} \mathbf{skip} \{\phi\}} \quad \frac{\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\} \quad \vdash \{\psi\} c' \{\eta\}}{\vdash \{\phi\} c; c' \{\eta\}} \\
 \\
 \text{WEAK} \quad \text{CONST} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\} \quad \models \phi' \rightarrow \phi \quad \models \psi \rightarrow \psi'}{\vdash \{\phi'\} c \{\psi'\}} \quad \frac{\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\} \quad \text{FV}(\eta) \cap \text{MV}(c) = \emptyset}{\vdash \{\phi \wedge \eta\} c \{\psi \wedge \eta\}} \\
 \\
 \text{DCOND} \quad \text{TRUE} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\psi\} \quad \vdash \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} c' \{\psi\}}{\vdash \{\phi\} \mathbf{if}_D b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c' \{\psi\}} \quad \frac{}{\vdash \{\top\} c \{\top\}} \\
 \\
 \text{DLOOP} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\phi\}}{\vdash \{\phi\} \mathbf{while}_D b \mathbf{do} c \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\}} \\
 \\
 \text{RDCOND} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\psi\} \quad \vdash \{\phi \wedge \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} c' \{\psi\} \quad \models \phi \rightarrow (\text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false}) \vee \text{Ct}(b = \text{false}))}{\vdash \{\phi\} \mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c' \{\psi\}} \\
 \\
 \text{RCOND} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi * \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\psi * \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} \quad \vdash \{\phi * \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} c' \{\psi * \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} \quad \psi \in \text{SP}}{\vdash \{\phi * \mathbf{D}(b)\} \mathbf{if}_R b \mathbf{then} c \mathbf{else} c' \{\psi * \mathbf{D}(b)\}} \\
 \\
 \text{CONJ} \quad \text{CASE} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi_1\} c \{\psi_1\} \quad \vdash \{\phi_2\} c \{\psi_2\}}{\vdash \{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2\} c \{\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2\}} \quad \frac{\vdash \{\phi_1\} c \{\psi_1\} \quad \vdash \{\phi_2\} c \{\psi_2\}}{\vdash \{\phi_1 \vee \phi_2\} c \{\psi_1 \vee \psi_2\}} \\
 \\
 \text{RCASE} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi * \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} c \{\psi * \text{Ct}(b \neq \text{false})\} \quad \vdash \{\phi * \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} c \{\psi * \text{Ct}(b = \text{false})\} \quad \psi \in \text{SP}}{\vdash \{\phi * \mathbf{D}(b)\} c \{\psi * \mathbf{D}(b)\}} \\
 \\
 \text{FRAME} \\
 \frac{\vdash \{\phi\} c \{\psi\} \quad \text{FV}(\eta) \cap \text{MV}(c) = \emptyset \quad \text{FV}(\psi) \subseteq T \cup \text{RV}(c) \cup \text{WV}(c) \quad \models \phi \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(T \cup \text{RV}(c))}{\vdash \{\phi * \eta\} c \{\psi * \eta\}}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 5: Rules inherited from PSL [4].

*Proof.* We note firstly that for any two inputs  $S_1, S_2$ , the statistical distance between  $f(S_1)$  and  $f(S_2)$  is at most  $2\epsilon$ , since the distance between each  $f(S_i)$  and  $D$  is at most  $\epsilon$  and by the transitivity of statistical distance.

Let function  $g : E \rightarrow [0, 1]$  model the attacker's strategy of guessing the result, where  $E$  is the set of all possible observations and  $g(e)$  represents the probability that the attacker guesses  $S_1$  under observation  $e$ ; otherwise the attacker guesses  $S_2$  with the probability  $1 - g(e)$ . Then the overall probability of a correct guess is:  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} (f(S_1)(e) \cdot g(e) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} (f(S_2)(e) \cdot (1 - g(e)))$

Because both  $f(S_1)(e)$  and  $f(S_2)(e)$  are smaller or equal to  $\max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e))$ , the above expression is smaller or equal to  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e))$ .

Then because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E} \max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) + \sum_{e \in E} \min(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) &= \sum_{e \in E} f(S_1)(e) + f(S_2)(e) = 2 \text{ and} \\ \sum_{e \in E} \max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) - \sum_{e \in E} \min(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) &= \sum_{e \in E} |f(S_1)(e) - f(S_2)(e)| = 2\text{SD}(a, b), \\ \text{we have } \sum_{e \in E} \max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) &= (2 + \text{SD}(f(S_1), f(S_2)))/2 \leq 1 + 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have the correct probability is smaller or equal to  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \max(f(S_1)(e), f(S_2)(e)) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$

Fig. 6: Proof of Lemma 1

```

synthetic( $S, O, n$ ) :
1   $A[0] \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,7\}}$ ;
2   $A[1] \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,7\}}$ ;  $i \leftarrow 0$ ;
3  while  $n > i$  do
4     $O \leftarrow O + A[S[i]]$ ;
5     $m \leftarrow 8$ ;  $j \leftarrow 0$ ;
6    while  $A[S[i]] > j$  do
7       $m \leftarrow 2 \times m$ ;  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
8      if  $(j + S[i]) \% 3 == 0$  then
9         $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
10    $t \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{1,2,3,\dots,m\}}$ ;
11    $A[S[i]] \leftarrow t \% 8$ ;
12    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;

```

Fig. 7: A synthetic motivating example algorithm.



## C Case Studies

### C.1 The Melbourne Shuffle

The Melbourne Shuffle [29] is a probabilistic oblivious algorithm that takes an array (database)  $I$  and a target permutation  $\pi$  as its secret input. Its job is to shuffle  $I$  according to the permutation  $\pi$ , placing the shuffled data into the output array  $O$ . To do so, it makes use of a (larger) temporary array  $T$ . The algorithm is designed to be oblivious despite the access patterns of  $I, T$  and  $O$  being observable to attackers.

In practice, this algorithm is designed to facilitate e.g. oblivious training of machine learning models in the cloud: the arrays  $I$  and  $O$  are held locally by a client; shuffling is performed by a server whose memory is  $T$ . All communication between the client and server is encrypted; however, there might be spies who can nonetheless observe the access patterns to the three arrays (e.g. via cache side channels). Moreover, the cloud provider might be malicious and so might directly observe the contents of array  $T$  to learn the secret data or the desired permutation. For this reason, the algorithm keeps the contents of  $T$  encrypted.

Our verification abstracts away from the client-server communication and encryption, effectively assuming the latter is perfect. We capture the threat model above by adding ghost code (i.e. code that records information during an algorithm without affecting the execution of the algorithm) to record the attacker’s observations of the memory access patterns to arrays  $I, T$  and  $O$ . Throughout this paper, ghost code is written in blue.

The algorithm appears in Fig. 8. Its ghost code records the memory access pattern as a sequence  $Trace$  of accesses. Each access is a tuple  $(oper, A, k)$  where  $oper$  is the operation performed by the access (e.g. read/write/copy),  $A$  is the array being accessed (e.g.  $I$ ), and  $k$  is the position of the array being accessed by the operation. For operations that copy the entire contents of one array to another,  $k$  will denote the source array. Given a sequence  $A$ , we define  $size(A)$  as the length of  $A$ ,  $A + a$  as the result of appending  $a$  to  $A$  and  $A ++ B$  to concatenate two arrays  $A$  and  $B$ .

As when the algorithm was proposed [29], target permutations  $\pi$  are represented as functions from a piece of data to its expected index [29]. For example, if the array is  $[x, y, z]$  and  $\pi(x) = 1, \pi(y) = 0, \pi(z) = 2$ , then after a shuffle pass, the output should be  $[y, x, z]$ . Without loss of generality, the input array  $I$  is assumed to contain distinct elements.

We write  $F(I)$  to represent the set of all possible  $\pi$  given a array  $I$ .

The Melbourne shuffle hides the target permutation  $\pi$  by performing the shuffle in two passes. In the first pass, it randomly selects a permutation  $\pi_1$  from the set of all possible permutations of  $I$  and shuffles  $I$  into  $T$  according to  $\pi_1$ . This ensures that the items in  $T$  are at unpredictable locations. It is therefore now safe to shuffle  $T$  into  $O$  according to the desired permutation  $\pi$ .

This algorithm has a small chance of failing. In particular, because the arrays  $I$  and  $O$  are necessarily smaller than  $T$ , the internal `shuffle_pass` function

```

function SHUFFLE( $I, \pi, O$ )
   $Trace \leftarrow []$ 
   $\pi_1 \leftarrow_s \mathbf{U}_{F(I)}$ 
   $T \leftarrow []$ 
  shuffle_pass( $I, T, \pi_1, O, Trace$ )
   $I \leftarrow O; Trace \leftarrow Trace + ("copy", "O", "I")$ 
  shuffle_pass( $I, T, \pi, O, Trace$ )
end function

```

Fig. 8: The Melbourne Shuffle

can fail for certain choices of its given permutation. Fortunately the probability of failure is a negligible function of the size of  $I$  [29].

We construct a perfectly oblivious approximation of Fig. 8 by modifying the random selection of  $\pi_1$  so that rather than choosing from all permutations  $F(I)$  it instead selects from the set of permutations under which the algorithm doesn't fail. The resulting algorithm and its proof is shown in Fig. 9. Letting  $\pi_I$  denote the unique permutation that describes the contents of the input array  $I$ , this set of permutations under which the algorithm doesn't fail is  $S_p(\pi_I) \cup S_p(\pi)$ , where  $S_p$  is defined as follows.

Let  $V(\pi, i, j) = \{v \mid i \leq \pi(v) < j\}$  denote  $i$ th to  $j$ th values in the permutation  $\pi$ . Then  $S_p$  is a function that takes a permutation whose length is  $n$ , and returns the set of permutations for which the input array uniquely described by  $\pi$  can be shuffled without failure.  $S_p$  is defined as the set of all  $\pi'$  such that:

$$\text{size}(\pi) = \text{size}(\pi') = n \text{ and } \forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \sqrt{n} - 1\}, \\ \text{size}(V(\pi, \sqrt{n} \cdot i, \sqrt{n} \cdot (i + 1)) \cap V(\pi', \sqrt{n} \cdot i, \sqrt{n} \cdot (i + 1))) \leq p \cdot \log(n).$$

This definition of  $S_p$  is symmetric about  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ , so we have that  $\forall \pi, \pi'. \pi \in S_p(\pi') \iff \pi' \in S_p(\pi)$ . Thus, the Melbourne shuffle succeeds if and only if  $\pi_1 \in S_p(\pi_I) \cup S_p(\pi)$  [29, Lemma 4.4].

The statistical distance between Fig. 9 and Fig. 8 is at most a negligible function of  $n$  [29, Lemma 4.3]. We can thus verify Fig. 8 by proving perfect obliviousness of the approximation in Fig. 9.

We do so by applying our logic to prove that it produces a fixed, deterministic memory access pattern. Letting  $\text{TS}("I", "T", "O", n)$  denote the unique memory access pattern produced by calling  $\text{shuffle\_pass}(I, T, \pi, O)$  for any  $\pi$ , we prove the memory access pattern of Fig. 9 is  $\text{TS}("I", "T", "O", n) + ("copy", "O", "I") ++ \text{TS}("I", "T", "O", n)$ , as shown in the final postcondition.

The precondition of Fig. 9 states that the initial array  $I$  contains  $n$  unique elements, and that  $\pi_I$  does indeed describe its contents correctly.

This proof relies on the inner function `shuffle_pass` adhering to the following specification.

$$\{\text{Ct}(Trace = X \wedge \text{size}(I) = n = \text{size}(\text{Set}(I)) \wedge (\forall v \in I. I[\pi_1(v)] = v) \wedge \pi \in S_p(\pi_1))\} \\ \text{shuffle\_pass}(I, T, \pi, O, Trace) \\ \{\text{Ct}(Trace = X ++ \text{TS}("I", "T", "O", n) \wedge \text{size}(O) = n = \text{size}(\text{Set}(O)) \wedge (\forall v \in O. O[\pi(v)] = v))\}$$

```

function SHUFFLE'(I, π, O)
  {Ct(size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧ ∀v ∈ I. I[π_I(v)] = v)}
  Trace ← []
  {Ct(Trace = [] ∧ size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧ ∀v ∈ I. I[π_I(v)] = v)}
  π₁ ←ₛ U_{S_p(π) ∩ S_p(π_I)}
  {Ct(Trace = [] ∧ size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧ (∀v ∈ I. I[π_I(v)] = v)) * U_{π₁}[S_p(π) ∩ S_p(π_I)]}
  {Ct(Trace = [] ∧ size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧ (∀v ∈ I. I[π_I(v)] = v) ∧ π₁ ∈ S_p(π) ∩ S_p(π_I))}
  T ← []
  {Ct(Trace = [] ∧ size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧ (∀v ∈ I. I[π_I(v)] = v) ∧ T = [] ∧ π₁ ∈ S_p(π) ∩ S_p(π_I))}
  shuffle_pass(I, T, π₁, O, Trace)
  {Ct(Trace = TS("I", "T", "O", n) ∧ size(O) = n = size(Set(O)) ∧ (∀v ∈ O. O[π₁(v)] = v) ∧
  π₁ ∈ S_p(π) ∩ S_p(π_I))}
  I ← O; Trace ← Trace + ("copy", "O", "I")
  {Ct(Trace = TS("I", "T", "O", n) + ("copy", "O", "I") ∧ size(I) = n = size(Set(I)) ∧
  (∀v ∈ I. I[π₁(v)] = v) ∧ π ∈ S_p(π₁))}
  shuffle_pass(I, T, π, O, Trace)
  {Ct(Trace = TS("I", "T", "O", n) + ("copy", "O", "I") ++ TS("I", "T", "O", n) ∧
  size(O) = n = size(Set(O)) ∧ (∀v. O[π(v)] = v))}
end function
    
```

Fig. 9: Verification of the perfect Melbourne shuffle.  $\text{Set}(A)$  is the set of values in array  $A$ .

Note that this is a classical Hoare logic specification, and that `shuffle_pass` is a deterministic algorithm. Therefore this specification can be proved in classical Hoare logic [14] and so is omitted. Importantly, the postcondition of this specification states also that the shuffle is correctly performed:  $\forall v \in O. O[\pi(v)] = v$ . This is crucial as otherwise the two calls to `shuffle_pass` cannot be chained together (as the precondition for the second call relies on this assumption). Thus the obliviousness of this algorithm depends on its correctness. This explains the vital importance of being able to mix classical correctness reasoning with probabilistic reasoning, as supported by our logic via the  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$  assertions and associated rules (Fig. 3).

## C.2 Oblivious Sampling

Our second case study is oblivious random sampling [32]. This algorithm makes use of an oblivious shuffling primitive, which can be implemented using the Melbourne shuffle from Appendix C.1. As alluded to in Appendix C.1, oblivious sampling is an important part of oblivious training algorithms for machine learning, e.g. to randomly sample mini-batches.

The algorithm [32] takes a secret database (an array)  $D$  of size  $n$  as input, and will output several arrays  $(s[0], s[1], \dots, s[k])$  where each contains  $m$  pieces of independently sampled data from  $D$ . Moreover,  $n = m \cdot k$ . The memory access pattern of the database  $D$ , temporary array  $S$  and the returned arrays  $s[\dots]$  are observable to attackers. As in Appendix C.1, we abstract from encryption and client-server communication.

The perfectly oblivious approximation of the algorithm, with ghost code to capture the observable memory access pattern, is shown in Fig. 10. The source of imperfection in the original algorithm is the oblivious shuffle primitive, which here has been replaced by uniform random choice  $D \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(D)}$  over the set  $\text{Perm}(D)$  of permutations of  $D$  (and likewise for  $S$ ), thereby removing the source of imperfection. We prove the resulting approximation is perfectly oblivious.

Following the original algorithm [32], the array  $SWO$  is a two-dimensional array of booleans of size  $k \times n$ , which is randomly chosen from the set  $X(n, m)$  which contains all such arrays such that  $\forall i \in \{1 \dots k\}$ , the number of **true** in  $SWO[i][1 \dots n]$  is  $m$ . Unlike in the Melbourne Shuffle (Appendix C.1, where arrays are indexed from 1), the arrays in Fig. 10 are indexed from 0 [29, 32].

```

Trace ← [];
D ←§ UPerm(D); Trace ← Trace + oblshuffle(n)
SWO ←§ UX(n,m); S ← []; j ← 1; l ← 1;
e ← D[1]; Trace ← Trace + (“read”, “D”, 1)
enext ← D[1]; Trace ← Trace + (“read”, “D”, 1)
whileR l < n + 1 do
  i ← 1
  whileR i < k + 1 do
    ifR SWO[i][j] then
      S ← S + (e, i);
      Trace ← Trace + (“write”, “S”, size(S) + 1);
      l ← l + 1;
      enext ← D[l];
      Trace ← Trace + (“read”, “S”, l)
    i ← i + 1;
  e ← enext; j ← j + 1;
S ←§ UPerm(S); Trace ← Trace + oblshuffle(size(S))
s ← [[], [], ⋯, []]; //k empty arrays
p ← 1;
whileR p < size(S) + 1 do
  (e, i) ← S[p];
  Trace ← Trace + (“read”, “S”, p)
  s[i] ← s[i] + e;
  Trace ← Trace + (“write”, “s”, i, size(s[i]) + 1)
  p ← p + 1;

```

Fig. 10: Rewritten Sampling Algorithm

The verification of the sampling algorithm has two main parts. The first part is from the beginning of the algorithm to the end of the first loop. In this part, the memory access trace is deterministic, and so we prove that as a certainty via  $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$  reasoning. At this point, we have that the trace is a deterministic value

(captured by the predicate  $\text{inv}(\text{Trace})$ ), plus some certain information about  $\text{snd}(S)$ , which is essential for the verification that follows.

The second part of the verification covers the remaining code, which shuffles  $S$  and then produces a memory access pattern which is a deterministic function of (the shuffled)  $\text{snd}(S)$ . We thus prove perfect obliviousness by proving that the overall memory access trace is uniformly distributed (and thus independent of secrets).

Then we introduce the detailed reasoning of the proof, sketched in Fig. 11. The reasoning is as follows.

Let  $A[i..j]$  denote the sub-array from  $A[i]$  to  $A[j]$  and  $\text{Count}(v, A)$  represent the number of occurrences of  $v$  in the array  $A$ . Suppose  $B$  is an array of tuples, then let  $\text{snd}(B)$  represent the array of all the second elements of the tuples in the array  $B$ .

Let  $\text{inv}(\text{Trace})$  be a predicate on traces that holds if and only if:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Trace}[1..3] = [\text{oblshuffle}(n), (\text{"read"}, \text{"D"}, 1), (\text{"read"}, \text{"D"}, 1)] \wedge \quad \forall x, 3 < x \leq \text{size}(\text{Trace}) \implies \\ (x\%2 = 0 \implies \text{Trace}[x] = (\text{"write"}, \text{"S"}, (x-2)/2)) \\ \wedge (x\%2 = 1 \implies \text{Trace}[x] = (\text{"read"}, \text{"S"}, (x-3)/2)) \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\text{inv2}(\text{Trace}, S)$  be a predicate that holds if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inv}(\text{Trace}[1..2n+3], S) \wedge \text{Trace}[2n+4] = \text{oblshuffle}(n) \wedge \\ \forall x, j. (2n+4 < x \leq \text{size}(\text{Trace}) \wedge j = (x - (2n+3))/2) \implies \\ (x\%2 = 1 \implies \text{Trace}[x] = (\text{"read"}, \text{"S"}, j) \\ \wedge (x\%2 = 0 \implies \text{Trace}[x] = \\ (\text{"write"}, \text{"s"}, \text{snd}(S)[j], \text{Count}(\text{snd}(S)[j], \text{snd}(S)[1..j]))) \end{aligned}$$

At the beginning, we have  $\{\text{Ct}(n = m \times k)\}$ .

Then, just before the first loop, we can apply random assignment rule, CONST rule, random sample rule, and weak rule to get:

$$\{\text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = [\text{oblshuffle}(n), (\text{"read"}, \text{"D"}, 1), (\text{"read"}, \text{"D"}, 1)] \wedge n = m \times k \wedge S = [] \wedge j = l = 1 \wedge e = e_{\text{next}} = D[1] \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge \text{SWO} \in X(n, m))\}$$

Then, for the first loop, we use the loop invariant:

$$\{\text{Ct}(n = m \times k \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge \text{SWO} \in X(n, m) \wedge l = \text{size}(S) + 1 = (\text{size}(\text{Trace}) - 1)/2 = \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[1..k][1..j-1]) + 1 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[x][1..j-1]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S))) \wedge \text{size}(\text{Trace})\%2 = 1)\}$$

For the inner loop, we use another loop invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{Ct}(n = m \times k \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge \text{SWO} \in X(n, m) \wedge l = \text{size}(S) + 1 = (\text{size}(\text{Trace}) - 1)/2 \\ = \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[1..k][1..j-1]) + \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[1..i-1][j]) + 1 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge \\ (\forall x. 0 < x < i \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[x][1..j]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S))) \wedge (\forall x. i \leq x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, \text{SWO}[x][1..j-1]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S))))\} \end{aligned}$$

```

{Ct( $n = m \times k$ )}
Trace  $\leftarrow$  [];
 $D \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(D)}$ ; Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + oblshuffle( $n$ )
SWO  $\leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{X(n,m)}$ ;  $S \leftarrow$  [];  $j \leftarrow 1$ ;  $l \leftarrow 1$ ;
 $e \leftarrow D[1]$ ; Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("read", "D", 1)
 $e_{next} \leftarrow D[1]$ ; Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("read", "D", 1)
{Ct(Trace = [oblshuffle( $n$ ), ("read", "D", 1), ("read", "D", 1)]  $\wedge n = m \times k \wedge S = [] \wedge j = l = 1 \wedge e = e_{next} = D[1] \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge SWO \in X(n, m)$ )}
Start Unif-Idp rule on SWO and Trace
whileR  $l < n + 1$  do
  Loop Invariant:
  {Ct( $n = m \times k \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge SWO \in X(n, m) \wedge l = \text{size}(S) + 1 = (\text{size}(\text{Trace}) - 1)/2 = \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[1..k][1..j - 1]) + 1 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[x][1..j]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S))) \wedge \text{size}(\text{Trace}) \% 2 = 1 \wedge l \leq n + 1$ )}
   $i \leftarrow 1$ 
  whileR  $i < k + 1$  do
    Loop Invariant:
    {Ct( $n = m \times k \wedge D \in \text{Perm}(D) \wedge SWO \in X(n, m) \wedge i \leq k + 1 \wedge l = \text{size}(S) + 1 = (\text{size}(\text{Trace}) - 1)/2 = \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[1..k][1..j - 1]) + \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[1..i - 1][j]) + 1 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x < i \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[x][1..j]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S))) \wedge (\forall x. i \leq x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(\text{true}, SWO[x][1..j - 1]) = \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)))$ )}
    ifR SWO[ $i$ ][ $j$ ] then
       $S \leftarrow S + (e, i)$ ;
      Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("write", "S", size(S) + 1);
       $l \leftarrow l + 1$ ;
       $e_{next} \leftarrow D[l]$ ;
      Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("read", "S",  $l$ )
       $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
     $e \leftarrow e_{next}$ ;  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
  {Ct(size(Trace) =  $2n + 3 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m$ ))}
   $S \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(S)}$ ;
  {Ct(size(Trace) =  $2n + 3 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m$ ))  $\wedge \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(S_e)}[\text{snd}(S)]$ }
  Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + oblshuffle(size(S))
   $s \leftarrow$  [], [], ..., []; //k of empty arrays
   $p \leftarrow 1$ ;
  {Ct(inv2(Trace, S)  $\wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge p = \text{size}(\text{Trace})/2 - n - 1 \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m$ ))  $\wedge \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(S_e)}[\text{snd}(S)]$ }
  Start Const rule with  $\mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(S_e)}[\text{snd}(S)]$ 
  {Ct(inv2(Trace, S)  $\wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge p = \text{size}(\text{Trace})/2 - n - 1 \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m$ )  $\wedge (\forall y. 0 < y \leq k \implies \text{size}(s[y]) = \text{Count}(y, \text{snd}(S)[1..p - 1]))$ } (Invariant for the last loop)
  whileR  $p < \text{size}(S) + 1$  do
     $(e, i) \leftarrow S[p]$ ;
    Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("read", "S",  $p$ )
     $s[i] \leftarrow s[i] + e$ ;
    Trace  $\leftarrow$  Trace + ("write", "s",  $i, \text{size}(s[i]) + 1$ )
     $p \leftarrow p + 1$ ;
  {Ct(inv2(Trace, S)  $\wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge p = \text{size}(\text{Trace})/2 - n - 1 \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m$ )  $\wedge p > \text{size}(S)$ )}
  {Ct(Trace =  $f(\text{snd}(S)) \wedge (f \text{ is bijective})$ )}
  End Const rule
  {Ct(Trace =  $f(\text{snd}(S)) \wedge (f \text{ is bijective})$ )  $\wedge \mathbf{U}_{\text{Perm}(S_e)}[\text{snd}(S)]$ }
  { $\mathbf{U}_{f(S_e)}[\text{Trace}]$ }
  End Unif-Idp rule
  { $\mathbf{U}_{f(S_e)}[\text{Trace}] * \mathbf{D}(SWO)$ }

```

Fig. 11: Verification of Sampling Algorithm

Both loop invariants can be proved by applying the random assignment rule, weak rule, and random if rule. After the two-layer loop, we know the first loop invariant holds and  $l > n$ . By the weak rule, we obtain:

$$\{\text{Ct}((\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m) \wedge \text{size}(\text{Trace}) = 2n + 3 \wedge \text{inv}(\text{Trace}) \wedge \text{size}(S) = n)\}$$

Note that  $\text{inv}(\text{Trace})$  is satisfied by at most one  $\text{Trace}$  of a particular length. So we know that  $\text{Trace}$  has a deterministic value at this point.

After the random choice following the loop, let  $Se$  be an array containing  $m$  occurrences of every number between 1 and  $k$ . Then we have that  $\text{U}_{\text{Perm}(Se)}[\text{snd}(S)]$  in addition to the previous assertion, by the random sample rule. Then we apply the random assignment rule and weak rule several times to obtain the following assertion before the last loop:

$$\{\text{Ct}(\text{inv2}(\text{Trace}, S) \wedge (\forall x. 0 < x \leq k \implies \text{Count}(x, \text{snd}(S)) = m) \wedge \text{size}(S) = n \wedge p = \text{size}(\text{Trace})/2 - n - 1 \wedge (\forall y. 0 < y \leq k \implies \text{size}(s[i]) = \text{Count}(i, \text{snd}(S)[1..p - 1]))) \wedge \text{U}_{\text{Perm}(Se)}[\text{snd}(S)]\}$$

Then we use the **CONST** rule to add the Uniform assertion between the loop, and use the  $\text{Ct}(\dots)$  part of the above assertion as the last loop's invariant, which can be proved by applying the random loop, random if, random assignment, and weak rules. Finally, we obtain the above assertion and  $p > \text{size}(S)$ . This information implies that the value of  $\text{Trace}$  is a bijective function of  $\text{snd}(S)$ , which means  $\text{Trace}$  also satisfies a uniform distribution. We can also apply the **UNIF-IND** rule to show  $\text{Trace}$  is independent of  $SWO$ . Note that since  $Se$  is independent of the original database contents  $D$ , we have trivially that  $\text{Trace}$  is independent of  $D$ .

### C.3 Path ORAM

Path ORAM [36] is a (probabilistic) oblivious RAM algorithm. It allows a client to conceal its access pattern to some remote storage. When the client wants to read/write something from/to the remote storage, it calls the function **ACCESS**( $op, a, data^*$ ) where  $op$  is the type of access being performed (read or write),  $a$  is the virtual (i.e. as seen by the client) storage location being accessed, and  $data^*$  is either `None` (in the case of a read access) or is a value to be written (in the case of a write access). The physical location of  $a$  in the remote server is stored in the global array  $Q$  (originally called *position* in [36]). This location changes following the execution of the algorithm, to hide (subsequent) access pattern of future executions of the algorithm.

The original presentation of the algorithm included a perfectly oblivious approximation [36, Figure 1], and bounded the statistical distance between it and the practical version of the algorithm [36, Section 5]. Thus our focus is to prove the perfectly oblivious version is indeed perfectly oblivious.

Our goal is to prove that any two sequences of operations of the same length produce indistinguishable memory access patterns, in the sense that both are uniformly distributed over the same set of possibilities. A sequence of operations corresponds to a series of calls to the **ACCESS** function, e.g. a sequence could

be  $[(\text{write}, a, 1), (\text{read}, a, \text{None})]$ , and would correspond to two calls to the access function: namely  $\text{Access}(\text{write}, a, 1)$  followed by  $\text{Access}(\text{read}, a, \text{None})$ . The distribution of the memory access pattern produced by this sequence should be identical to any other sequence of operations of length 2.

The algorithm appears in Fig. 12 where, as earlier, we add ghost code to capture the observable memory access pattern and abstract from encryption and communication. This figure follows the original [36, Figure 1], renaming the original *position* array to  $Q$  for brevity. We also add an additional ghost variable  $T'$  to record the initial value of  $Trace$ , which will be useful in the verification. The only two observable commands are the function calls of  $\text{WriteBucket}()$  and  $\text{ReadBucket}()$ , where their parameters  $x$  and  $l$  determine the physical locations that are accessed.

```

function ACCESS( $op, a, data^*, Trace$ )
   $T' \leftarrow Trace$ 
   $x \leftarrow Q[a]$ 
   $Q[a] \leftarrow \mathbf{U}_{\{0..(2^L-1)\}}$ 
   $l \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileR  $l \leq L$  do
     $S \leftarrow S \cup \text{ReadBucket}(P(x, l))$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"ReadBucket()"}, x, l)$ 
     $l \leftarrow l + 1$ 
   $data \leftarrow \text{find}(a, S)$ 
  ifD  $op = \text{write}$  then
     $S \leftarrow (S - \{(a, data)\}) \cup \{(a, data^*)\}$ 
   $l \leftarrow L$ 
  whileR  $l \geq 0$  do
     $S' \leftarrow \{(a', data') \in S : P(x, l) = P(Q[a'], l)\}$ 
     $S' \leftarrow \text{select}(Z, S')$ 
     $S \leftarrow S - S'$ 
     $\text{WriteBucket}(P(x, l), S')$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"WriteBucket()"}, x, l)$ 
     $l \leftarrow l - 1$ 
end function

```

Fig. 12: Rewritten path ORAM

We prove perfect obliviousness by proving that  $\text{ACCESS}$  maintains the following invariant on the observable memory access trace  $Trace$ : given any initial memory access pattern  $Trace$  satisfying a fixed uniform distribution, the resulting access pattern after calling  $\text{ACCESS}$  (an extension of  $Trace$ ) still satisfies a fixed uniform distribution.

We prove maintenance of a global invariant by proving that the algorithm maintains its key implementation invariant [36, Section 3], which we refer to in this paper as the Main Invariant: each block is mapped to a uniformly random leaf bucket in the tree (whose height is  $L$ ), i.e. every value in the array  $Q$  satisfies



the uniform distribution on  $\{0..(2^L - 1)\}$  and is independent of the others. The Main Invariant is encoded as an assertion in our logic using the  $\mathbf{U}[\cdot]$  and  $*$  operators (see below).

Then the verification proceeds as follows. Let  $W = \{0..(2^L - 1)\}$  and  $n = \text{size}(Q)$  which also means the number of (virtual) locations that can be accessed. As shown in Fig. 13, we start with our desired invariant. It includes the Main Invariant which is simply  $\{(\mathbf{U}_W[Q[0]] * \mathbf{U}_W[Q[1]] * \dots * \mathbf{U}_W[Q[n]])\}$ , plus the fact that there exists a fixed set  $Y$  where  $Trace$  satisfies the uniform distribution on it, independently to the Main Invariant.

```

function ACCESS(op, a, data*, Trace)
  {Main Invariant *  $\mathbf{U}_Y[Trace]$ }
   $T' \leftarrow Trace$ 
  {Main Invariant *  $\mathbf{U}_Y[Trace] \wedge \text{Ct}(Trace = T')$ }
   $x \leftarrow Q[a]$ 
   $\{\mathbf{U}_W[Q[0]] * \dots * \mathbf{U}_W[x] * \dots * \mathbf{U}_W[Q[n]] * \mathbf{U}_Y[Trace] \wedge \text{Ct}(Trace = T')\}$ 
   $Q[a] \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\{0..(2^L-1)\}}$ 
   $\{(\text{Main Invariant} * \mathbf{U}_Y[T'] * \mathbf{U}_W[x]) \wedge \text{Ct}(Trace = T')\}$ 
  (Start CONST rule)  $\{\text{Ct}(Trace = T')\}$ 
   $l \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileD  $l \leq L$  do
     $S \leftarrow S \cup \text{ReadBucket}(P(x, l))$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"ReadBucket()"}, x, l)$ 
     $l \leftarrow l + 1$ 
   $data \leftarrow \text{find}(a, S)$ 
  ifD  $op = \text{write}$  then
     $S \leftarrow (S - \{(a, data)\}) \cup \{(a, data^*)\}$ 
   $l \leftarrow L$ 
  whileD  $l \geq 0$  do
     $S' \leftarrow \{(a', data') \in S : P(x, l) = P(Q[a'], l)\}$ 
     $S' \leftarrow \text{select}(Z, S')$ 
     $S \leftarrow S - S'$ 
    WriteBucket( $P(x, l), S'$ )
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"WriteBucket()"}, x, l)$ 
     $l \leftarrow l - 1$ 
   $\{\text{Ct}(Trace = T' ++ f(x))\}$  (End CONST rule)
   $\{(\text{Main Invariant} * \mathbf{U}_Y[T'] * \mathbf{U}_W[x]) \wedge \text{Ct}(Trace = T' ++ f(x))\}$ 
  {Main Invariant *  $\mathbf{U}_{Y \times f(W)}[Trace]$ }
end function
    
```

Fig. 13: Verification of path ORAM.

The verification of the first three lines of code is performed by unfolding the Main Invariant, and using the random assignment rule, frame rule and the weak rule, then refolding the Main Invariant. Then we use the CONST rule to carry all the information except  $\text{Ct}(Trace = T')$  to the end of this function as these facts are never modified. Thanks to using the CONST rule, reasoning proceeds via clas-

sical ( $\text{Ct}(\cdot)$ ) reasoning. It is easy to prove that at the end of the function we have  $\text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = T' ++ f(x))$ , where  $f(x) = [(\text{ReadBucket}(), x, 0), \dots, (\text{ReadBucket}(), x, L), (\text{WriteBucket}(), x, L), \dots, (\text{WriteBucket}(), x, 0)]$ .

Finally, we convert this assertion using the third proposition in Proposition 1 and the proposition introduced above to prove the desired invariant.

#### C.4 Path Oblivious Heap

```

function INSERT( $k, v$ )
   $pos \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,N-1\}}$ 
  Add( $B_{root}, (k, v, (pos, \tau))$ )
   $P \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,N/2-1\}}$ 
   $P' \leftarrow_{\$} \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2, N/2+1, \dots, N-1\}}$ 
  Evict( $P$ )
  UpdateMin( $P$ )
  Evict( $P'$ )
  UpdateMin( $P'$ )
  return ( $pos, \tau$ )
end function

function DELETE( $pos, \tau$ )
  ReadNRm( $pos, \tau$ )
  Evict( $pos$ )
  UpdateMin( $pos$ )
end function

```

Fig. 14: The main interfaces of the Path Oblivious Heap. See Appendix D for the sub-functions.

The Path Oblivious Heap [34] provides the standard interfaces of a heap including element insertion, deletion, finding the minimum, and extracting the minimum (this last being a combination of finding and deletion). The Path Oblivious Heap has been used to implement oblivious sorting [34], among other applications. The Path Oblivious Heap is inspired by Path ORAM [36] and shares the same data tree structure and several sub-functions. However, unlike Path ORAM which provides only one interface, the Path Oblivious Heap provides multiple such which increases somewhat the complexity of its verification.

As a heap, the algorithm has two main interfaces. The INSERT function takes two parameters: the key  $k$  and value  $v$  to be inserted; it returns two values:  $pos$  and  $\tau$ , the position and timestamp of the inserted element that together uniquely identify the inserted element in the heap. Timestamps are allocated deterministically: the first item inserted into the heap has timestamp 0, the second 1, and so on. The DELETE function takes a position  $pos$  and a timestamp  $\tau$  and removes the corresponding element that they uniquely identify.

This algorithm is designed to hide the contents of the key-value parameters passed to INSERT (i.e., to hide the heap data), but not the kind of heap operations performed (i.e., whether INSERT or DELETE was called), to an adversary who can observe the algorithm's memory access pattern. Thus the adversary is assumed to know what heap operations will be performed and in what order; although not the parameters passed to those operations. As such, since timestamps are

Let  $\text{inv}([pos_1, pos_2, \dots, pos_n]) = \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_1] * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_2] * \dots * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_n]$ .

```

function INSERT( $k, v$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E)$ }
     $pos \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,N-1\}}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos])$ }
     $\text{Trace}' \leftarrow \text{Trace}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}')$ }
    Add( $B_{root}, (k, v, (pos, \tau))$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace}' = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TA}(\text{root}))$ }
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\}}[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos])$ }
     $P \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\{0,1,2,\dots,N/2-1\}}$ 
     $P' \leftarrow_{\S} \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2, N/2+1, \dots, N-1\}}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\}}[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N/2-1\}}[P] * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P']$ }
     $\text{Trace}' \leftarrow \text{Trace}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\}}[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N/2-1\}}[P] * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P'] \wedge$ 
    Ct( $\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}'$ )}
    Evict( $P$ )
    UpdateMin( $P$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\}}[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N/2-1\}}[P] * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P'] \wedge$ 
    Ct( $\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TE}(P) ++ \text{TU}(P)$ )}
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\} \times \{\text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid 0 \leq p < N/2\}}[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P']$ }
     $\text{Trace}' \leftarrow \text{Trace}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\} \times \{\text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid 0 \leq p < N/2\}}[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P'] \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}')$ }
    Evict( $P'$ )
    UpdateMin( $P'$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\} \times \{\text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid 0 \leq p < N/2\}}[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{N/2..N-1\}}[P'] \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TE}(P') ++ \text{TU}(P'))$ }
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TA}(\text{root})\} \times \{\text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid 0 \leq p < N/2\} \times \{\text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid N/2 \leq p < N\}}[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E ++ [pos])$ }
    return ( $pos, \tau$ )
end function

function DELETE( $pos, \tau$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E) \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E)$ }
     $\text{Trace}' \leftarrow \text{Trace}$ 
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E) \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}')$ }
    ReadNRm( $pos, \tau$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E) \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TR}(pos))$ }
    Evict( $pos$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E) \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TR}(pos) ++ \text{TE}(pos))$ }
    UpdateMin( $pos$ )
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E) \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E) \wedge \text{Ct}(\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TR}(pos) ++ \text{TE}(pos) ++ \text{TU}(pos))$ }
    (removing  $pos_i$  from invariant)
    { $\mathbf{U}_T[\text{Trace}'] * \text{inv}(E \setminus [pos]) * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos] \wedge \text{Ct}(pos \in E) \wedge$ 
    Ct( $\text{Trace} = \text{Trace}' ++ \text{TR}(pos) ++ \text{TE}(pos) ++ \text{TU}(pos)$ )}
    (using proposition 1.8)
    { $\mathbf{U}_{T \times \{\text{TR}(p) ++ \text{TE}(p) ++ \text{TU}(p) \mid 0 \leq p < N\}}[\text{Trace}] * \text{inv}(E \setminus [pos])$ }
end function
    
```

Fig. 15: Path Oblivious Heap (Fig. 14) Verification.

deterministically allocated, they reveal no information and so, following [34]’s original presentation, for simplicity we largely ignore them henceforth.

Our verification applies to a perfectly oblivious approximation that never fails; in practice the failure probability (and, thus, the statistical distance between the real implementation and the perfectly oblivious approximation that we verify) is bounded by a negligible quantity [34, Corollary 2], thereby allowing Lemma 1 to conclude obliviousness for the imperfect algorithm.

Our goal is to prove that any two sequences of operations of the same length and that perform the same types of operations in the same order produce indistinguishable memory access patterns, in the sense that both are uniformly distributed over the same set of possibilities. A sequence of operations corresponds to a series of calls to the interfaces, e.g. a sequence could be [INSERT, INSERT, DELETE]. The distribution of the memory access pattern produced by two executions of this sequence should be identical regardless of the parameters passed in each.

Fig. 14 depicts the oblivious heap algorithm [34, Section 3.3], where as earlier we add ghost code to capture the observable memory access pattern  $Trace$  and abstract from encryption and communication. The various sub-functions (e.g.,  $Evict$ ,  $UpdateMin$ ) also update  $Trace$  to record their memory-access patterns.

In Fig. 15, we prove perfect obliviousness by proving that each interface (1) maintains an invariant  $inv(E)$ , where  $E$  is the sequence of existing elements’ position in the heap, and (2) ensures that the resulting memory-access pattern is uniformly distributed over a fixed set independent of the input parameters. The invariant states that each position is independently uniformly distributed over the fixed set of possible positions:

$$inv([pos_1, pos_2, \dots, pos_n]) = \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_1] * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_2] * \dots * \mathbf{U}_{\{0..N-1\}}[pos_n]$$

The preconditions in Fig. 15 should be read as quantifying over  $T$ , the set over which the historical memory-access pattern is uniformly distributed.

We put the classical, Hoare logic verification of the sub-functions and the interface of finding minimum in the next section (they are totally deterministic). The classical specification for each sub-function states that it adds to the  $Trace$  a fixed access pattern that depends only on the input parameter. For instance,  $Evict$ ’s classical Hoare logic specification is:

$\vdash \{Trace = Trace'\} Evict(x) \{Trace = Trace' ++ TE(x)\}$ , where  $TE(x)$  (“Trace of  $Evict$ ”) abbreviates the access pattern for  $Evict$  for input parameter  $x$ .

We follow this same naming convention throughout: e.g.  $TU(x)$  is the memory-access pattern of  $UpdateMin(x)$ . For a set  $X$ , we write  $TE(X)$  to mean  $\{TE(x) \mid x \in X\}$  and so on.

DELETE’s precondition makes sure its input is valid (we only delete existing elements). We first add a ghost variable  $Trace'$  to record the initial value of  $Trace$  and then use  $Ct(\cdot)$  (certain) reasoning for the following three function calls. Finally we convert the assertion to the desired one by Proposition 1. To

do so, we use the fact that  $TR, TE, TU$  are bijective and always produce the sequence with the same length on their valid inputs (from 0 to  $N-1$ ) respectively, to satisfy the assumption of the 8th proposition of Proposition 1.

Finally, the verification of INSERT shares the same idea as DELETE, repeated several times. Note,  $TA(\text{root})$  is a fixed sequence because sub-function ADD's memory-access pattern is independent of ADD's arguments.  $pos$  is the position of the inserted element and is never used or leaked in this function. It is recorded in the invariant and will be released (and leaked) when it is deleted; however, as explained in Section 2.1, doing so reveals nothing since  $pos$  was chosen uniformly and independently of secrets.

## D Path Oblivious Heap Deterministic Sub-functions

The path oblivious heap is implemented internally by two arrays: there is an array  $tree$  of tree nodes that represents the tree, and an array  $min$  where  $min[i]$  stores the minimum element of the sub-tree rooted at node  $tree[i]$ . The length of both arrays is  $2N$ ; however index 0 is unused, as is standard for using an array to represent a heap.

The reads and writes to both arrays are observable to the attacker.

Each node in the tree has a fixed number of positions for storing elements, where an element has the form  $(k, v, \tau)$  for key  $k$ , value  $v$  and timestamp  $\tau$ . The number of positions for the root node ( $n_{\text{root}}$ ) is decided by the algorithm's security parameter [34], whereas the number of positions for the other nodes is 4. All of them store a dummy element DUMMY initially.

We use ghost code to record the accesses to the  $tree$  and  $min$  arrays. When we access a position  $tree[i][j]$ , we add (" $read$ ",  $i, j$ ) or (" $write$ ",  $i, j$ ) into the memory-access trace depending on which type of access was performed. Similarly, when we access a position  $min[i]$ , we add (" $readMin$ ",  $i$ ) or (" $writeMin$ ",  $i$ ) into the trace. When we read an entire node, we use (" $readAll$ ",  $i$ ) to denote [ $(read, i, 0), (read, i, 1), \dots$  up to the number of positions for the node; we use corresponding notation for write accesses.

Given an integer  $p$  such that  $0 \leq p < N$ , we define  $\text{path}(p)$  as the sequence of indexes of the path from the root to the  $p$ th leaf of the tree. For example,  $\text{path}(0) = [1, 2, 4, \dots, N]$ . We also define  $\text{pathR}(p)$  as the reversed sequence of  $\text{path}(p)$ .

Then the sub-functions and corresponding specifications are in Fig. 17. The corresponding functions that define their memory-access patterns are in Fig. 16.

$$\text{TA}(x) = \text{TD}(x) = \begin{cases} [(\text{"read"}, 1, 0), (\text{"write"}, 1, 0), \dots, (\text{"read"}, 1, n_{\text{root}}), (\text{"write"}, 1, n_{\text{root}})], & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ (root)} \\ [(\text{"read"}, x, 0), (\text{"write"}, x, 0), \dots, (\text{"read"}, x, 3), (\text{"write"}, x, 3)], & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{TR}(x) = \text{TD}(\text{path}(p)[0]) ++ \text{TD}(\text{path}(p)[1]) ++ \dots ++ \text{TD}(\text{path}(p)[\log(N)])$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TU}(x) = & [(\text{"readAll"}, \text{pathR}(x)[0]), (\text{"writeMin"}, \text{pathR}(x)[0])] ++ \\ & [(\text{"readAll"}, \text{pathR}(x)[1]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \text{pathR}(x)[1]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \text{pathR}(x)[1] + \\ & 1), (\text{"writeMin"}, \text{pathR}(x)[1])] ++ [(\text{"readAll"}, \text{pathR}(x)[2]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \\ & \text{pathR}(x)[2]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \text{pathR}(x)[2] + 1), (\text{"writeMin"}, \text{pathR}(x)[2])] ++ \dots ++ \\ & [(\text{"readAll"}, \text{pathR}(x)[\log(N)]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \text{pathR}(x)[\log(N)]), (\text{"readMin"}, 2 * \\ & \text{pathR}(x)[\log(N)] + 1), (\text{"writeMin"}, \text{pathR}(x)[\log(N)])] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TE}(x) = & [(\text{"readAll"}, \text{path}(x)[0]), (\text{"readAll"}, \text{path}(x)[1]), \dots, (\text{"readAll"}, \text{path}(x)[\log(N)])] ++ \\ & [(\text{"writeAll"}, \text{path}(x)[0]), (\text{"writeAll"}, \text{path}(x)[1]), \dots, (\text{"writeAll"}, \text{path}(x)[\log(N)])] \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 16: Path Oblivious Heap's trace functions

```

function ADD( $i, k, v, \tau, Trace$ )
  { $Trace = Trace'$ }
   $s \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
   $j \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileD  $j < \text{length}(\text{tree}[i])$  do
     $w \leftarrow \text{tree}[i][j]$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"read"}, i, j)$ 
    ifD  $w = \text{DUMMY} \wedge (!s)$  then
       $w \leftarrow (k, v, \tau)$ 
       $s \leftarrow \text{true}$ 
       $\text{tree}[i][j] \leftarrow w$ 
       $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"write"}, i, j)$ 
       $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
    { $Trace = Trace' + TA(i)$ }
  end function

function DEL( $i, \tau, Trace$ )
  { $Trace = Trace'$ }
   $j \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileD  $j < \text{length}(\text{tree}[i])$  do
     $w \leftarrow \text{tree}[i][j]$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"read"}, i, j)$ 
    ifD  $\tau = w[2]$  then
       $w \leftarrow \text{DUMMY}$ 
       $\text{tree}[i][j] \leftarrow w$ 
       $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"write"}, i, j)$ 
       $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
    { $Trace = Trace' + TD(i)$ }
  end function

function EVICT( $p, Trace$ )
  { $Trace = Trace'$ }
   $i \leftarrow 0$ 
   $A \leftarrow []$ 
  whileD  $i < \log(2N)$  do
     $A \leftarrow A + \text{tree}[\text{path}(p)[i]]$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"readAll"}, \text{path}(p)[i])$ 
     $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
   $A \leftarrow \text{Evict\_Locally}(A)$ 
  whileD  $i < \log(2N)$  do
     $\text{tree}[\text{path}(p)[i]] \leftarrow A[i]$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"writeAll"}, \text{path}(p)[i])$ 
     $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
  { $Trace = Trace' + TE(p)$ }
  end function

function READNRM( $p, \tau, Trace$ )
  { $Trace = Trace'$ }
   $j \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileD  $j < \log(2N)$  do
    DEL( $\text{path}(p)[j], \tau, Trace$ )
     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
  { $Trace = Trace' + TR(p)$ }
  end function

function UPDATEMIN( $p, Trace$ )
  { $Trace = Trace'$ }
   $i \leftarrow 0$ 
  whileD  $i < \log(2N)$  do
     $j \leftarrow \text{pathR}(p)[i]$ 
     $A \leftarrow \text{tree}[j]$ 
     $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"readAll"}, j)$ 
    ifD  $i > 0$  then
       $A \leftarrow A + \min[2j] + \min[2j + 1]$ 
       $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"readMin"}, 2j)$ 
       $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"readMin"}, 2j + 1)$ 
       $\min[j] \leftarrow \min(A)$ 
       $Trace \leftarrow Trace + (\text{"writeMin"}, j)$ 
       $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
    { $Trace = Trace' + TU(p)$ }
  end function

```

Fig. 17: Path Oblivious Heap's deterministic sub-functions. Evict\_Locally moves elements from the root towards the leaf on a given path, as described in [34, Section 3.2]. It operates over the private memory  $A$  and so its memory accesses are unobservable to the attacker.

