# MapComp: A Secure View-based Collaborative Analytics Framework for Join-Group-Aggregation

Xinyu Peng<sup>\*†</sup>, Feng Han<sup>†</sup>, Li Peng<sup>\*†(⊠)</sup>, Weiran Liu<sup>†</sup>, Zheng Yan<sup>‡</sup>,

Kai Kang<sup>†</sup>, Xinyuan Zhang<sup>†</sup>, Guoxing Wei<sup>†</sup>, Jianling Sun<sup>\*</sup>, Jinfei Liu<sup>\*</sup>

\*Zhejiang University, <sup>†</sup>Alibaba Group, <sup>‡</sup>Xidian University

\*{steven.pengxy, jerry.pl}@alibaba-inc.com, {sunjl, jinfeiliu}@zju.edu.cn,

<sup>†</sup>{fengdi.hf, weiran.lwr, pufan.kk, xinyuan.zxy, guoxing.wgx}@alibaba-inc.com, <sup>‡</sup>zyan@xidian.edu.cn

Abstract—This paper introduces MapComp. a novel viewbased framework to facilitate join-group-aggregation (JGA) queries for collaborative analytics. Through specially crafted materialized view for join and novel design of group-aggregation (GA) protocols, MapComp removes duplicated join workload and expedites subsequent GA, improving the efficiency of JGA query execution. To support continuous data updates, our materialized view offers payload-independence feature and brings in significant efficiency improvement of view refreshing with free MPC overhead. This feature also allows further acceleration for GA, where we devised multiple novel protocols that outperform prior works. Notably, our work represents the *first* endeavor to expedite secure collaborative JGA queries using materialized views. Our experiments show a great improvement in our view operations and GA protocols, achieving up to zero refresh time and  $1140.5 \times$ faster than the baseline, respectively. Moreover, our experiments demonstrate a significant advantage of MapComp, achieving up to a  $2189.9 \times$  efficiency improvement compared to the non-view based baseline when executing queries eight times.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Data analysis has become indispensable for numerous businesses seeking valuable insights. Since valuable data is collected and held within different parties, there are significant potentials for data holders to derive great benefits by collectively analyzing their private datasets [1]–[3]. Among statistical data analysis queries, join-group-aggregation (JGA) queries are particularly crucial for extensive applications including market investigation [4], advertisement conversion analysis [1], [5], online auction analysis [6], and constitutes a substantial portion of real-world analytics [7]. The JGA query paradigm involves first performing a join over input relations, followed by a sequence of group-aggregation (GA) processes. However, collaborative JGA query poses privacy threats, as shown in the following example:

**Motivating Example.** Consider an online advertisement supplier (AS) that knows the users who have clicked a particular advertisement for a product, and a product company (PC) that places advertisements on AS and knows who has purchased a product. AS has a relation ad(userld, productld, clickDate), while PC maintains a relation order(userld, productld, orderAmount). AS may want to compute the total sales brought by the advertisement each day, i.e., the total amount spent by users who made a corresponding purchase after seeing an advertisement:

SELECT ad.clickDate, sum(order.orderAmount) FROM ad JOIN order ON ad.userId = order.userId AND ad.productId = order.productId GROUP BY ad.clickDate

The challenge in evaluating this JGA query is that the relations are held by two parties respectively as their private data, whose sharing is restricted by privacy concerns and regulations [8], [9]. To address this challenge, a promising paradigm is to perform secure queries over *private data federation* [2] with privacy-preserving techniques such as secure multi-party computation (MPC) to ensure end-to-end privacy.

While recent efforts have focused on secure collaborative analytics over data federation using MPC [2], [10]–[14], performance overhead persists due to two primary reasons. First, the cryptographic primitives used in MPC-based query solutions are costly, resulting in an overhead of approximately  $1000 \times$  compared with querying plaintext databases [2]. Second, MPC-based solutions typically follow the paradigm of one-time query processing. Multiple queries are executed independently, inhibiting the reuse or pre-computation of common, resource-intensive workloads. While longstanding efforts have addressed the first issue by improving MPC efficiency through enhanced cryptographic building blocks [15]–[19] and exploring privacy-efficiency trade-offs with differential privacy [20], [21], the second issue remains largely unexplored in the literature.

This paper is centered on accelerating real-world deployment of collaborative JGA queries, especially for multiple queries execution. To tackle this, we face two main problems. First, the join workload may be highly repetitive and expensive. Specifically, it is common for multiple JGA queries to operate on the same joined table with various ad-hoc GA processes, making the join process duplicated. A secure join process is also typically conducted with a heavy cryptographic workload of at least O(n) complexity [22], [23], accounting for a considerable overhead of the whole JGA workload. Second, the overhead of existing secure GA processes is expensive in multiple queries. Recent works [10], [12]-[14] rely on the oblivious bitonic sorting-based approach [24], which incurs substantial overhead due to its  $O(nl \log^2 n)$  complexity. These two problems severely limit the efficiency and applications of secure JGA queries. To this end, can we design a JGA query framework that reduces the duplicated join overhead

# and enables a faster GA process?

Challenges. To address the above efficiency problems, adopting a pre-computed materialized view [25] to cache intermediate join results and a new design of GA protocols hold promise. Nevertheless, designing such a system poses several challenges. First, a secure materialized view must facilitate lightweight refreshing with payload (the attributes in addition to the join keys, such as group-by and aggregation attributes) updates. In practical scenarios, databases undergo dynamic and frequent updates due to business growth or status changes, while the join key usually remains static [26]. For example, financial institutions continually update client account balances in real-time to ensure prompt and accurate service provision and business analysis. However, previous secure join efforts [22], [23] couple the join alignment and the encryption of tuple payloads, fail in considering payload dynamic. Upon any update of data tuples, the join result requires a complete rebuild from scratch to conceive update patterns [27], resulting in substantial redundant computation. Second, the subsequent processing over the materialized view of join (e.g., GA operation over the view) requires careful design to ensure compatibility with the view's data structure and optimization for efficiency. Recent effort [27] introduced a view-based query processing paradigm in a growing database scenario. However, efficient payload updating is not addressed, necessitating a complete re-run of the view generation process for every update to an existing tuple. In addition, the efficient execution of subsequent GA queries over the secure materialized view remains unclear.

**Contributions.** In this paper, we introduce MapComp, a novel framework that supports a view-based query processing paradigm to expedite secure JGA queries. Inspired by the idea of using a join index as a materialized view [28], MapComp designs a specially crafted materialized view to eliminate duplicated join workload and expedite subsequent GA queries. To support efficient view refreshing according to payload dynamics, our designed view decouples the join alignment with the encryption of payloads, which we call *payload independence*. In contrast to previous works that rely on the payload-dependent process with at least O(n) MPC complexity, our view allows *free* view refreshing without requiring any MPC operations. To generate the view, we devise three novel protocols that balance security and efficiency based on private set operation protocols (*e.g.*, Private ID [29]).

Furthermore, we propose optimized GA protocols that perform on our proposed view. With the help of payload independence, the payload inputs for GA remain in plaintext. Consequently, we can further optimize GA protocols by partial local processing and leveraging insights into the inherent characteristics of plain data. We improve conventional oblivious bitonic sorting-based approaches by using stable sorting and/or bitmaps to perform group dividing, resulting in more efficient GA for multiple cases of group cardinality. Experimental results show that MapComp outperforms standard solutions without a view-based paradigm, achieving up to a  $2189.9 \times$ 



Fig. 1: System architecture and workflow.

improvement when executing queries eight times. Moreover, our optimized GA protocols achieve up to a  $1140.5 \times$  improvement compared to traditional oblivious sorting-based solutions.

To the best of our knowledge, MapComp is the first framework to accelerate secure collaborative JGA queries using a materialized view. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- We propose a novel view-based framework MapComp for accelerating secure JGA queries. MapComp utilizes a secure materialized view to minimize the duplicate cost of secure analysis and support efficient view-refreshing.
- We devise three novel view generation protocols that provide a trade-off between security and efficiency based on private set operation protocols.
- We introduce multiple optimized protocols to perform secure GA over the proposed view that outperform existing methods by leveraging sorting optimizations and bitmaps.
- We implement MapComp and the experimental results verify the efficiency and effectiveness.

# II. MAPCOMP OVERVIEW

## A. System Overview

The system architecture and workflow of MapComp are shown in Fig. 1. MapComp involves two roles: 1) two mutually distrustful data owners  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , and 2) the analyst. Data owners have private data stored in local databases, and will coordinately execute a secure protocol to compute the result of a query issued by the analyst. The analyst is agreed upon by all parties before any computation starts, and a data owner can also play the role of an analyst. In the rest of our paper, we treat  $\mathcal{P}_1$  as the analyst to describe our protocols for simplicity. Similar to [12], we assume the database schema, the query and the size of input databases are public knowledge.

1) Workflow: Initially, the data owners register into the system and set up local database servers. Then, the owners identify the relations to be involved in JGA queries and run the view generation process to generate materialized join views. The views are cached intermediate data to accelerate follow-up JGA queries. Subsequently, when the original data is updated, the data owner can initiate a view refresh to keep the view up-to-date , thereby providing correct query results. Upon receiving the analyst's online ad-hoc JGA query, data owners can run the GA protocols directly on the corresponding materialized join view to obtain the aggregation result. Since

generating materialized join views is a one-time task, the duplicated join is eliminated, and the whole workload is sped up. It is worth mentioning that the view generation is decoupled with subsequent GA in the JGA query, so it can be performed anytime preferred before JGA running, *e.g.*, offline, to minimize online overhead.

2) *Query formulation:* This paper focuses on the JGA queries, whose pattern is described as follows:

Select $\mathbb{R}^{0}.g_{0}$ , $\mathbb{R}^{1}.g_{1}$ , $\operatorname{agg}_{0}(\mathbb{R}^{0}.v_{0})$ , $\operatorname{agg}_{1}(\mathbb{R}^{1}.v_{1})$
From $\mathbb{R}^0$ Join $\mathbb{R}^1$ on $\mathbb{R}^0.k = \mathbb{R}^1.k$ Group by $\mathbb{R}^0.g_0, \mathbb{R}^1.g_1$ ;

Consider two relations  $\mathbb{R}^0, \mathbb{R}^1$  are owned by  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$ respectively. We abbreviate the above JGA query as  $\mathcal{G}_{(q_0,q_1), \mathsf{agg}(v_0,v_1)}(\mathbb{R}^0 \Join_k \mathbb{R}^1)$ , where  $\mathbb{R}^0 \Join_k \mathbb{R}^1$  means  $\mathbb{R}^0$  join  $R^1$  on  $R^0 k = R^1 k$  and k is the join attribute. The above query partitions the join result according to a set of grouping attributes  $(g_0, g_1)$ , and then computes the aggregate functions  $agg(\cdot)$  over the aggregation attributes  $v_0, v_1$  for each group, where  $agg(v_0, v_1)$  is the abbreviation of  $\{agg_u(v_u)\}_{u \in \{0,1\}}$ , and  $agg_u$  can be max, min, sum, and count. Multiple join or group attributes from one party can be concatenated together as input, so we can denote them as a single attribute for simplicity. The expression evaluation of multiple attributes before GA, e.g.,  $agg(v_0 \times v_1)$ , is naturally covered since it can be realized with plain/encrypted pairwise computation. This paper focuses on equi-join and considers the PK-PK join (join on two primary keys) and the PK-FK join (join on a primary key and a foreign key), which covers most statistical queries [7].

# B. Security Model

MapComp aims to protect data throughout the entire lifecycle. To evaluate the query, parties in MapComp execute computation and exchange messages according to a protocol. MapComp focuses on the semi-honest two-party computation model [30]. Each party can be compromised by an adversary who can monitor the protocol transcript and the parties' internal state without altering its execution. Our protocols are the sequential composition of individual sub-protocols that are provably secure, so they inherit security guarantees of the underlying protocols. For the view generation protocols, three security levels are defined and proved based on leaked information as introduced in §IV-C. For the GA protocols, all intermediate results are oblivious to parties.

#### C. Challenges

For JGA queries, creating a materialized view to eliminate heavy duplicated workload helps to enhance the whole efficiency. Prior secure query [2], [10]–[14] or secure join [22], [23] efforts adopt a way of feeding entire tuples into secure protocols, then output encrypted/secret-shared result to ensure obliviousness. When the original data is static, creating a cached join view is trivial. Simply storing the transcript of the join output satisfies to enable subsequent workload. However, this way fails for dynamic data payload. A view refreshing under payload updating requires rebuilding the view from scratch. Otherwise, the update pattern would be leaked [27]. This leads to a significant overhead when view refreshing is frequently invoked or underlying payload are continually updated. Thus, we face the first challenge *C1: How to formalize and construct a materialized join view that supports efficient refresh?* 

A GA operation is to first partition the input relation according to the group keys, then perform aggregation on the correct subset of the tuples. Due to the privacy requirement, the partition must be performed in a data-oblivious way. Therefore, previous works of GA resort to an oblivious sortingbased partition approach [13], [31]. The inputs and outputs are encrypted/secret-shared, so intermediate information is protected. The most commonly used sorting approach is oblivious bitonic sort [24], which yields  $O(nl \log^2 n)$  circuit size when sorting length-n l-bits elements. Due to its expensive computation/communication cost, the sorting process becomes a performance bottleneck. Thus, we face the second challenge C2: How to reduce the cost of GA?

## D. Key Ideas

1) Building a materialized view with payload independence: A key insight is that the essence of a join process is to match and align tuples with the same join keys. The matching process can be persisted via a join index [28], which is fundamentally a mapping function  $\pi$  and is a special form of materialized view [32]. Our starting point is to securely generate  $\pi$  as a materialized view without encrypting payloads, allowing subsequent workloads to be performed directly on it. Different from previous works where the whole tuples are all encrypted [22], [23], our approach enjoys payload *independence*, which means the mapping  $\pi$  and the payload are plaintext and decoupled. It eliminates the need to refresh views in an encrypted way when updating data, thus enabling a free refresh. To generate the view, we propose three novel protocols by leveraging private set operation protocols and prove that they achieve different security levels respectively.

2) Reducing the cost of GA: Since the input relations fed into GA protocols are plaintext due to *payload independence* of the designed materialized view, we can optimize the conventional oblivious sorting-based GA with following ideas:

**O1:** Oblivious sorting can be replaced by oblivious stable sorting with shorter input. A sorting-based secure GA generally relies on an oblivious sorting protocol to obliviously gather the elements within each group together by sorting on  $g_0, g_1$  from  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  respectively [13], [31]. We note that when one party's input is plaintext (W.L.O.G. assuming it is  $g_1$ ), he can first locally sort  $g_1$ , then invoke an oblivious stable sorting with a single input  $g_0$ . Compared with trivially feeding an oblivious sorting with the full size of all group fields  $g_0, g_1$ , it reduces the bit length of sorting input, thereby improving its efficiency. We denote it as  $P_{oSorting}$  and describe it in §V-A. **O2:** Stable sorting can be further optimized. We observed that when the input of another party is also plaintext (W.L.O.G. assuming it is  $g_0$ ), we can exploit the input cardinality to further optimize the oblivious stable sorting. Inspired by bucket

sorting [33], we design a more efficient stable sorting protocol for cases where input is plaintext and has a small cardinality by utilizing a bitmap (introduced in §III-E). The idea is to first encode  $g_0$  as a bitmap, the bit-vector of which indicates which bucket the corresponding tuple should be placed in. Then, the result of sorting can be obtained by counting and indexing over the bitmap. We describe the details in §V-B and denote it as P<sub>bSorting</sub>. Since the size of a bitmap is linear with the cardinality of group attribute  $d_0 = |\mathbb{D}^{g_0}|$ , this approach is more lightweight compared with the bitonic sort for small  $d_0$ input, which we will confirm in §VI with experiments.

**O3:** Oblivious sorting can be eliminated using a bitmap. Apart from using oblivious sorting, we observe that the gathering of elements based on  $g_0$  can also be achieved using bitmap encoding of  $g_0$  since each bit-vector of the bitmap naturally specifies a distinct group value. Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}_0$  locally encodes the plaintext group value into a bitmap that indicates whether each tuple belongs to the corresponding group. For the  $j^{th}$  value of  $\mathbb{D}^{g_0}$ , we can obliviously eliminate the influence of the rows whose value of  $g_0$  is not  $\mathbb{D}_j^{g_0}$  by using  $b^j$  as the "dummy" flag. Therefore, sorting on  $g_0$  is not required anymore. In exchange,  $d_0$  aggregations need to be performed. The protocol is detailed in §V-C as  $P_{mix}$ .

**O4:** Using two bitmaps when  $d_0d_1$  is small. Inspired by hash-based GA in plaintext databases [34], we design the bitmap-based protocol  $P_{bitmap}$  for small  $d_0d_1$  cases, where  $d_0 = |\mathbb{D}^{g_0}|, d_1 = |\mathbb{D}^{g_1}|$ . Similar to  $P_{mix}$ , we exploit the bitmap to specify a group. The difference is we encode both parties' group attributes into bitmaps and perform aggregation directly over them in parallel. It necessitates no oblivious permutation or sorting, while requires  $O(d_0d_1)$  aggregations. We describe it in §III-E.

#### **III. PRELIMINARIES**

## A. Notations

We denote [m, n] as the set  $\{m, m+1, \ldots, n\}$  for  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with  $m \leq n$  and [n] is shorthand for [1, n].  $ind(\phi)$  is an indicator function which outputs 1 when  $\phi$  is true or 0 otherwise. We use  $\perp$  to represent null and assume  $agg(\perp, x) = x$ holds for any aggregate function agg and input x. We denote  $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  as a vector with length |X| = n, and  $x_j = \perp$  for j > |X| in the follow-up. We denote X||Y as the vector  $(x_1||y_1, \ldots, x_n||y_n)$ . We represent an injective function  $\pi : [n] \to [m]$  as  $\pi = (\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n))$ , where  $m \ge n$ .  $Y = \pi \cdot X$  means applying  $\pi$  on a vector X, which outputs  $Y = (x_{\pi(1)}, ..., x_{\pi(n)})$ . For example, applying  $\pi = (2, 3, 1)$ on X = (a, b) will output  $Y = (b, \bot, a)$ . Specifically,  $\pi$  is a permutation when m = n. Given a table T, we denote  $T_i$ as its  $i^{\text{th}}$  tuple, T[v] as the vector containing all values of the attribute v, and  $T_i[v]$  as the *i*<sup>th</sup> value of T[v]. We denote  $\mathbb{D}^g$  as the domain space of attribute g, and  $\mathbb{D}_i^g$  as the *i*<sup>th</sup> distinct value in  $\mathbb{D}^{g}$ . We denote the group cardinality  $d_{0} = |\mathbb{D}^{g_{0}}|, d_{1} = |\mathbb{D}^{g_{1}}|,$ respectively. We use the letter with a subscript or superscript  $u \in \{0, 1\}$  to represent a value held by  $\mathcal{P}_u$ .

# B. Secret Sharing and Related Primitives

A 2-out-of-2 additive secret sharing scheme splits a secret value x into  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  with the constraint that  $x = x_0 + x_1 \mod 2^k$  for  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  (i.e.  $\langle x \rangle_i^{\mathsf{A}} = x_i$  is an arithmetic share) or  $x = x_0 \oplus x_1$  for  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$  (i.e.  $\langle x \rangle_i^{\mathsf{B}} = x_i$  is a binary share). Evaluating an arithmetic multiplication gate  $(\langle x \rangle^{\mathsf{A}} \cdot \langle y \rangle^{\mathsf{A}})$  or a binary AND gate  $(\langle x \rangle^{\mathsf{B}} \odot \langle y \rangle^{\mathsf{B}})$  requires precomputed multiplication triples and one round of communication between two parties [35]. An arithmetic addition gate  $(\langle x \rangle^{\mathsf{A}} + \langle y \rangle^{\mathsf{A}})$ , or a binary XOR gate  $(\langle x \rangle^{\mathsf{B}} \oplus \langle y \rangle^{\mathsf{B}})$  can be computed locally without communication.

We denote  $\langle x \rangle^{b}$  as the binary share of a bit  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\langle \neg x \rangle^{b}$  as  $\langle 1 - x \rangle^{b}$ . We denote  $P_{B2A}, P_{b2A}, P_{A2B}$  as protocols to convert between a binary share and an arithmetic share. Since the type conversions can be efficiently realized [17], [36], we simply write  $\langle x \rangle = (\langle x \rangle_{0}, \langle x \rangle_{1})$  ignoring the sharing type for a uniform description unless the sharing type is specified.

We additionally require the following protocols, whose realizations are described in [17], [37], [38]:

- P<sub>mul</sub>(f, x) takes a bit f from the receiver and x from the sender. It returns f? (x) : (0).
- $P_{mux}(\langle f \rangle^{b}, \langle x \rangle, \langle y \rangle)$  returns  $\langle r \rangle$  where r = f ? x : y.
- $P_{eq}(\langle x \rangle, \langle y \rangle)$  returns  $\langle ind(x=y) \rangle^{b}$ .

## C. Oblivious Primitives for a Shared Vector

**Oblivious switch network (OSN).**  $\mathbb{P}_{osn}^{p}$  [12], [39] takes a length-*n* vector *X* from the sender and an size-*n* permutation  $\pi$  from the receiver. It outputs a secret-shared length-*n* vector *Y* which satisfies  $y_i = x_{\pi(i)}$  for  $i \in [n]$ . It can be instantiated by Beneš network [40] with  $O(n \log n)$  communication and O(1) rounds. If the  $\langle X \rangle$  is given in secret-shared form, we can still switch it as follows. Sender inputs his share of *X*:  $\langle X \rangle_1$  and receives  $Y^1$ , while receiver inputs  $\pi$  and receives  $Y^0$ . Then, for  $i \in [n]$ , receiver sets  $\langle z_i \rangle_0 = y_i^0 \oplus \langle x_{\pi(i)} \rangle_0$  and sender sets  $\langle z_i \rangle_1 = y_i^1$ . The correctness holds since  $z_i = y_i^1 \oplus y_i^0 \oplus \langle x_{\pi(i)} \rangle_0 = \langle x_{\pi(i)} \rangle_1 \oplus \langle x_{\pi(i)} \rangle_0 = x_{\pi(i)}$ . For simplicity, we denote the above functionality as  $\langle Z \rangle \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{osn}^{s}(\pi, \langle X \rangle)$ .

**Random shuffle.**  $P_{shuffle}(\langle X \rangle)$  randomly samples a permutation  $\pi$  and permute  $\langle X \rangle$  into  $\langle Y \rangle$  based on  $\pi$ , i.e.,  $y_i = x_{\pi(i)}$  for  $i \in [|X|]$ . It can be realized by invoking  $P_{osn}^s$  twice in sequence, with the roles of two parties reversed and each party inputs a random permutation [41].

**Oblivious permutation.** Suppose two parties hold a shared permutation  $\langle \pi \rangle$  and a shared vector  $\langle X \rangle$ ,  $P_{perm}^{s}$  obliviously permutes  $\langle X \rangle$  based on  $\langle \pi \rangle$  and outputs  $\langle \pi \cdot X \rangle$ . The reverse version of  $P_{perm}^{s}$  is  $P_{invp}^{s}$  which outputs  $\langle \pi^{-1} \cdot X \rangle$ . As the work [42] suggests, they both can be efficiently realized with random shuffling. As an example,  $P_{invp}^{s}(\langle \pi \rangle, \langle X \rangle)$  processes as follows. The parties first invoke random shuffling to obtain  $(\langle \sigma \rangle, \langle Y \rangle) \leftarrow P_{shuffle}(\langle \pi \rangle, \langle X \rangle)$ . Then the parties open  $\langle \sigma \rangle$ , compute and output  $\langle Z \rangle = \sigma^{-1} \cdot \langle Y \rangle$  locally as the final output. Assuming the random permutation in  $P_{shuffle}$  is  $\phi$ , the correctness holds since  $\sigma^{-1} \cdot Y = (\phi \cdot \pi)^{-1} \cdot (\phi \cdot X) = \pi^{-1} \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \phi \cdot X = \pi^{-1} \cdot X$ .

**Oblivious stable sorting.** A sorting algorithm is *stable* if two items with the same keys appear in the same order in

the sorted result as they appear in the input [33]. A stable sorting  $P_{sSort}(\langle X \rangle)$  takes  $\langle X \rangle$  as input and outputs  $(\langle \pi \rangle, \langle Y \rangle)$ , where Y is the stable sorting result of X, and  $y_i = x_{\pi(i)}$ . It can be efficiently instantiated by sorting the keys and the corresponding indexes together [13].

**Permutation for one-bit vector.** Given a secret-shared onebit vector  $\langle V \rangle^{\rm b}$ ,  $P_{\rm perGen}(\langle V \rangle^{\rm b})$  generates a shared permutation  $\langle \pi \rangle$  representing a stable sort of V. For example, the permutation representing a stable sort of  $(\langle 1 \rangle^1, \langle 0 \rangle^2, \langle 1 \rangle^3, \langle 0 \rangle^4)$ is  $(\langle 3 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle, \langle 4 \rangle, \langle 2 \rangle)$ , and applying  $\pi^{-1}$  on V can obtain its (obliviously) stable sorting result  $(\langle 0 \rangle^2, \langle 0 \rangle^4, \langle 1 \rangle^1, \langle 1 \rangle^3)$ . Its underlying protocol [33], [42] takes O(1) round and the communication cost of  $O(n \log n)$  bits.

**Oblivious traversal.**  $P_{trav}$  [13] takes two length-*n* shared vectors  $\langle X \rangle, \langle V \rangle$  and an aggregate function agg as input, traverses and aggregates  $\langle V \rangle$  based on  $\langle X \rangle$  in a oblivious way, and outputs a length-*n* vector  $\langle Y \rangle$  which satisfies  $y_i = \text{agg}(\{v_j\}_{j=\text{first}(X,i)}^i)$  for  $i \in [n]$ . agg is a function whose basic unit satisfies the associative law. For example, when agg = sum, the basic unit is addition and satisfies (a + b) + c = a + (b + c). first(X, i) is the index of the first element within the group specified by  $X_i$ . For example, given  $X = (\underline{b}, \underline{b}, \underline{a}, \underline{a}, \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{b})$ , first(X, 4) = 3, first(X, 7) = 6.

# D. Private Set Operations

**PSI.** Private set intersection (PSI) [43]–[45] allows two parties to learn the intersection of two sets X and Y held by each party, without revealing any additional information.

**Private ID.** Given two sets X, Y from  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$  with  $|X| = n_x, |Y| = n_y$ , private ID (PID) [29], [46] output  $(\mathcal{M}, RI^*)$  to  $\mathcal{P}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a mapping function that maps a  $z \in X \bigcup Y$  to a random identifier  $\mathcal{M}(z) \in \{0, 1\}^l$ , and  $RI^* = \{\mathcal{M}(z) | z \in X \cup Y\}$  which is sorted in ascending order.

**Circuit PSI with payload.** Instead of outputting the set intersection in plaintext, circuit PSI [19], [47], [48] only outputs the secret shares of intersection.  $\mathbb{P}_{cpsi}$  takes X from receiver  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $(Y, \tilde{Y})$  from sender as input, where  $|X| = n_x, |Y| =$  $|\tilde{Y}| = n_y$  and  $\tilde{Y}$  is denoted as the payload associated with Y. Informally,  $\mathbb{P}_{cpsi}$  outputs two length- $n_x$  vectors  $\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$  and  $\langle Z \rangle$ to parties, where  $e_i = 1$ ,  $z_i = \tilde{y}_j$  if  $\exists y_j \in Y$ , s.t.  $y_j = x_i$ , and  $e_i = 0$ ,  $z_i = \bot$  otherwise.  $\mathbb{P}_{cpsi}$  hides the intersection and the payload, allowing further secure computation without revealing additional intermediate information. We refer to [48] for formal definition and instantiation.

# E. Bitmap

A bitmap that encodes attribute g is bit-vectors of number  $|\mathbb{D}^g|$ , each of which orderly represents whether tuples equal to  $\mathbb{D}_j^g$  for  $j \in [|\mathbb{D}^g|]$ . For example, an attribute g with  $|\mathbb{D}^g| = 3$  will be encoded as a bitmap of three bit-vectors. So the tuples (red, blue, red, yellow) will be encoded as  $(b^r, b^b, b^y)$ , where  $b^r = (1, 0, 1, 0), b^b = (0, 1, 0, 0), b^y = (0, 0, 0, 1)$ .

# IV. SECURE MATERIALIZED VIEW

In this section, we present the definition and structure of secure materialized view for JGA queries, the methods to generate and refresh the view, and discussion for extensions.



Fig. 2: A toy example of our materialized view, where E = (1, 0, 0, 1).

# A. Design Goals

A materialized view is generally a pre-computed intermediate table cached to eliminate the common, repeated workload of queries. In JGA queries, it is quite common that multiple queries involve a shared join workflow (*e.g.*, join on the same attributes under the same tables), making it desirable to cache the join result as a materialized view. Before moving into details, we first present our design goals.

- Correctness: A materialized view should always output the correct result as a query over the latest original tables.
- Efficient Refresh: A materialized view should support efficient view refresh for the latest payload updates. Otherwise, a costly refresh would prohibit the acceleration that the view-based paradigm itself brings.
- Security: The information leakage of the view should be bounded.

Next, we introduce the data structure of our proposed view, the core of which is a mapping function  $\pi$  that aligns the data held by two parties. Then, we describe how to securely generate it and show its advantage in refresh.

# B. Structure of View

We propose the data structure of our proposed (PK-PK join) materialized view and defer the details of the supporting for PK-FK join in §IV-E.

**Definition 1.** Given tables  $\mathbb{R}^0$  with join column values X and  $\mathbb{R}^1$  with join column values Y owned by two parties  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  respectively, a materialized (join) view  $\mathcal{V}_u$  held by  $\mathcal{P}_u$  ( $u \in \{0,1\}$ ) is defined as follow:

$$\mathcal{V}_u = (\pi_u, \langle E \rangle_u^b, \mathbf{J}^u)$$

where  $|\langle E \rangle_u^b| = |\pi_u| = n_e$  for some constant  $n_e \ge |X \cap Y|$ .  $\pi_0 : [n_e] \to [\max(n_e, |X|)]$  and  $\pi_1 : [n_e] \to [\max(n_e, |Y|)]$ are injective functions that map an index from  $[n_e]$  to an index from the original data.  $\langle E \rangle_u^b$  is the binary secret shares of intersection flag vector E. They satisfies  $|\{e|e \in E, e=1\}| =$   $|X \cap Y|$  and  $x_{\pi_0(i)} = y_{\pi_1(i)}$  iff  $e_i = 1$ .  $J^u = \pi_u \cdot \mathbb{R}^u$ , which means  $J^u$  is a re-ordered data transcript of  $\mathbb{R}^u$  such that tuple  $t_i \in J^u$  equals to  $t'_{\pi[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^u$  for  $i \in [|X|]$ .

The idea behind this design is straightforward. For each equivalent pair (x, y) in  $X \cap Y$  (e.g.,  $x \in X, y \in Y$  and x = y), applying mapping  $\pi_0, \pi_1$  on X, Y respectively maps x, y into the same position i with  $e_i = 1$ . It is easy to see that  $J^0$  and  $J^1$  are aligned since they have already been permuted based on  $\pi_0, \pi_1$  respectively, and the PK-PK join is essentially achieved. For subsequent GA  $\mathcal{G}_{g,agg(v)}$ , the  $J^u$  can

**Input:**  $\mathcal{P}_0$  with  $\mathbb{R}^0$ , whose join values is X.  $\mathcal{P}_1$  with set  $\mathbb{R}^1$ , whose join values is Y.  $|X| = n_x$ ,  $|Y| = n_y$  and  $n_x \ge n_y$ . **Protocol:** 

- 1) Invoke  $P_{cpsi}$ .  $\mathcal{P}_0$  acts as receiver with input X and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as sender with input (Y, O), where  $O = (1, 2, ..., n_y)$ . As the result, the parties get  $\langle E' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle Z' \rangle$ .
- 2) Invoke  $P_{osn}^s$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_0$  acts as receiver with a randomly sampled size- $n_x$  permutation  $\pi_0$ .  $(\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle Z \rangle) \leftarrow$  $\mathbb{P}^{s}_{osn}(\pi_0, (\langle E' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle Z' \rangle)).$
- 3) Invoke  $P_{cpsi}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_0$  acts as sender with input  $(X, \emptyset)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as receiver with input Y. the parties get  $\langle F' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$ .
- 4) If  $n_x > n_y$ , the parties extend  $\langle F' \rangle$  into a length- $n_x$  shared vector by padding shared zeros at the end of it.
- Invoke  $P_{\text{shuffle}}$ .  $(\langle F \rangle^{\flat}, \langle L \rangle) \leftarrow P_{\text{shuffle}}(\langle F' \rangle^{\flat}, \langle O' \rangle)$  where 5)  $O' = (1, 2, \ldots, n_x).$
- 6) Compute  $\langle \sigma_1 \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{perGen}(\langle F' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}), \langle P^1 \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{invp}^{\mathsf{s}}(\langle \sigma_1 \rangle, \langle L \rangle).$
- 7) Compute  $\langle \sigma_0 \rangle \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{perGen}(\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}), \langle P^0 \rangle \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{perm}^{\mathsf{s}}(\langle \sigma_0 \rangle, \langle P^1 \rangle).$
- Compute a shared permutation  $\langle \pi_1 \rangle$  with  $\langle \pi_1(i) \rangle$  $\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{P}_{\max}(\langle e_i \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle z'_i \rangle, \langle p_i^0 \rangle) \text{ for } i \in [n_x], \text{ and reveal } \pi_1 \text{ to } \mathcal{P}_1. \\ 9) \ \mathcal{P}_u \text{ compute } \mathsf{J}^u = \pi_u \cdot \mathsf{R}^u \text{ for } s \in \{0, 1\}. \end{array}$
- **Output:**  $\mathcal{P}_u$  returns  $\mathcal{V}_u = (\pi_u, \langle E \rangle_u^b, J^u)$ .

Fig. 3: Fully secure view generation protocol P<sub>secV</sub>.

be fed directly into secure protocols to get the desired output of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Therefore, as long as  $\mathcal{V}_{\mu}$  is consistent with the latest  $\mathbb{R}^{u}$ , the correctness of the query output under  $J^{u}$  is ensured. In addition, the intersection flag E indicates whether each tuple has been joined. It is in secret-shared form to prevent information leakage while enabling later secure computation. An example of our view is shown in Fig.2. The algorithm of using  $\mathcal{V}$  to support PK-FK join is shown in §IV-E.

#### C. View Generation

To generate  $\mathcal{V}$  from R, we propose different protocols to trade-off between efficiency and security. We propose three security definitions of view, the first and the second definitions of which are *relaxed* security definitions that may leak some bounded information while the last definition strictly requires no leakage. Then, we propose protocols based on private set operations protocols to generate views that satisfy the three definitions, respectively.

1) Security levels: Since  $\pi_u$  is required to be a random mapping relation and  $J^u$  of  $\mathcal{V}$  is plain-text, they both reveal nothing about the other party. Thus, we define the security levels based on the information leaked by E.

- level-0: E is revealed to two parties, which means parties know the intersection of two input sets.
- level-1: E is secret to two parties, i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_u$  only hold  $\langle E \rangle_u^b$ . and |E| = f(X, Y), where f is a public deterministic function. The size of E may leak some information about the input of the other party beyond the input size, e.g., the intersection size or the union size.
- level-2 (fully secure): E is secret to two parties, and  $|E| = f(n_x, n_y)$ , where f is a public deterministic function. We also say level-2 security is fully secure because the size of E leaks nothing beyond the input sizes  $n_x$  and  $n_y$ , which is assumed to be public.



Fig. 4: A running example of  $P_{secV}$  where the inputs are X = $(a, b, c, d), \pi_a = (3, 2, 4, 1), Y = (c, a, f), n_x = 4, n_y = 3.$ 

2) PSI-based view generation P<sub>psiV</sub>: PSI protocols [43]-[45] simply output the intersection to both parties, and we can directly use it to construct a level-0 view generation protocol. Specifically,  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  first run the PSI protocol to get the intersection of join values of R (denoted as X and Y).  $\mathcal{P}_0$ computes  $\pi_0$  representing the sorting order on intersection elements such that  $x_{\pi_0(i)} < x_{\pi_0(i+1)}$  and  $\forall x_{\pi_0(i)} \in X \cap Y$ ,  $i \in |X \cap Y|$ .  $\mathcal{P}_1$  computes  $\pi_1$  similarly. Two parties commonly set a length- $n_{xy}$  vector E = (1, ..., 1) as the intersection flag, where  $n_{xy} = |X \cap Y|$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{P}_u$  set  $\mathcal{V}_u = (\pi_u, E, J^u)$ , where  $J^u$  is a re-ordered data transcript of  $\mathbb{R}^u$  based on  $\pi_u$ .

3) PID-based view generation  $P_{pidV}$ :  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  first run the PID protocol. After receiving  $(\mathcal{M}, RI^*)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_0$  computes a length- $|RI^*|$  permutation  $\pi_0$  satisfying  $\forall i \in [|RI^*|]$ , if  $\exists x_i \in X \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{M}(x_i) = RI_i^*, \text{ then } \pi_0(i) = j.$  Similarly,  $\mathcal{P}_1$ computes  $\pi_1$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{P}_u$  outputs  $\mathcal{V}_u = (\pi_u, \langle E \rangle_u, J^u)$ , where  $\langle e_i \rangle = \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{eq}}(x_{\pi_0(i)}, y_{\pi_1(i)})$  for  $i \in [|P|]$ ,  $\mathsf{J}^u$  is a re-ordered data transcript of  $\mathbb{R}^{u}$  based on  $\pi_{u}$ .

4) Fully secure view generation P<sub>secV</sub>: Now we describe our fully secure view generation protocol P<sub>secV</sub>, the output of which reveals nothing beyond the input and output. W.L.O.G, we assume  $n_x \ge n_y$ . The case of  $n_x < n_y$  can be simply covered by reversing the roles of two parties. We describe our fully secure view generation protocol P<sub>secV</sub> in Fig. 3, and a running example of this procedure is shown in Fig. 4.

The protocol  $P_{secV}$  can be divided into two phases. The first phase (steps 1-2) is to compute E and Z, where  $e_i$ indicates whether  $x_{\pi_0(i)} \in X \cap Y$ . Z can be seen as a partial permutation, where for  $i \in [n_x]$ , if  $e_i = 1$ ,  $z_i$  is the index of  $y_j$  that equals to  $x_{\pi_0(i)}$ , and  $z_i = 0$  otherwise. The purpose of the second phase (steps 3-8) is to replace the 0s in Z with random values to make it become a length- $n_x$  permutation  $\pi_b$ , which is conducted by randomly mapping each index of a non-intersection element in Y to a position i where  $e_i = 0$ . To do this, the parties need to identify the non-intersection elements in Y, and it is done by the second invocation of circuit PSI in step 3. If  $n_x > n_y$ , the parties pad zeros into F'. To guarantee the randomness of  $\pi_1$ , the parties shuffle the index vector O' in step 5. If we track a value  $d \in [n_x]$ that  $d > n_y$  or  $y_d \notin X \cap Y$ , d will be shuffled to a random position i in L where  $F_i = 0$  after step 5. Then, through the correlation between E and F, the parties map each value  $l_i$ with  $f'_i = 0$  into a position j satisfying  $e_j = 0$  to obtain  $P^0$ . Since the numbers of 1 in E and F' are the same, the parties can sort L in the order of F' to obtain  $P^1$ , and then treat  $P^1$ 

as the result of sorting  $P^0$  in the order of E. Specifically, the parties compute a shared permutation  $\sigma_1$  representing a stable sorting of one-bit vector F', and applying  $\sigma_1^{-1}$  on L will sort L in order of F'. As shown in Fig. 4,  $P^1 = (3^{\underline{0}}, 4^{\underline{0}}, 1^{\underline{1}}, 2^{\underline{1}})$ . To reverse the sorting of  $P^1$  in the order of E, the parties compute a shared permutation  $\sigma_0$  representing a stable sorting of E, and apply  $\sigma_0$  on  $P^1$ . Finally,  $\pi_1$  is obtained with MUX gates in step 8, and  $\mathcal{P}_u$  is able to compute  $J^u = \pi \cdot \mathbb{R}^u$  and obtain the view  $\mathcal{V}_u$ .

**Theorem 1.** P<sub>psiV</sub> satisfies level-0 security, P<sub>sidV</sub> satisfies level-1 security, and P<sub>secV</sub> satisfies level-2 security.

Proof. See Appendix. A.

 $\textbf{Complexity analysis: } \mathtt{P}_{\mathtt{osn}}^s, \mathtt{P}_{\mathtt{shuffle}}, \mathtt{P}_{\mathtt{perm}}^{\mathtt{s}} \text{ and } \mathtt{P}_{\mathtt{invp}}^{\mathtt{s}} \text{ take } O(1)$ rounds and the communication cost of  $O(n \log n)$  bits, where  $n = max(n_x, n_y)$ . P<sub>cpsi</sub>, P<sub>perGen</sub> and P<sub>mux</sub> takes the communication cost of O(n) bits and O(1) rounds. Thus,  $P_{secV}$  takes the communication cost of  $O(n \log n)$  bits and O(1) rounds.

# D. View Refresh

To ensure the correctness of the query result when handling data dynamics,  $\mathcal{V}$  must be refreshed accordingly to reflect updates to the base relations [28]. Previous efforts require at least O(n) MPC complexity to refresh the join result upon any update since the mapping and payloads are all encrypted. However, the structure of our proposed  $\mathcal{V}$  is *payload-independent*. An update of the original data simply requires accessing and updating J based on the latest R accordingly to refresh  $\mathcal{V}$ . We describe the view refresh algorithm PVR in Fig.5. Upon with a payload update set  $\mathbb{R}^{\text{new}} = \{i_j, t_j^{\text{new}}\}_{j \in [n_{\text{new}}]}$  that contains the location and content of updated tuples,  $P_{\text{VR}}$  first computes  $i'_{i} = \pi(i_{j})$  for  $j \in [n_{new}]$ , which means it maps the index of the base table R to the corresponding index of data transcript J. Then, it accesses the  $i'_i$  -th tuples of J and updates it with  $t_i^{\text{new}}$  for all j, after which the refresh is finished. It leads to a free MPC overhead, making it very efficient. Moreover, the refresh does not necessitate any communication with the other party. Thus, intermediate information, e.g., data update pattern [27], is directly protected.

Our above view refresh focuses on the update of data payloads. When join keys are updated, we can support the case by rebuilding the view. We argue that this rarely happens in practice, since the value of the join key in a database is typically rarely changed to ensure logical relations between tables and high efficiency of indexing [26].

## E. Supporting for PK-FK Join

We build our PK-FK join view upon PK-PK join view with additional steps. Recall that the values of a FK join key are not unique, so they can be divided into groups. Our high-level idea is to first align a single tuple within a FK group with the corresponding value of the PK key. Then, we can obliviously duplicate the payloads of PK tuples to the correct locations to align the remaining tuples, so PK-FK join is achieved. The single-tuple alignment process can be re-used so the view

Input: 
$$\mathbb{R}^{\text{new}} = \{i_j, t_j^{\text{new}}\}_{j \in [n_{\text{new}}]}, \mathcal{V} = (\pi, \langle E \rangle^b, J).$$
  
Algorithm:  
1) For  $j \in [n_{\text{new}}]$ :  
• Compute  $i'_j \leftarrow \pi(i_j).$   
• Update  $t_{i'_j} \leftarrow t_j^{\text{new}}$ , where  $t \in J$ .  
2)  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{new}} \leftarrow (\pi, \langle E \rangle^b, J)$   
Output:  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{new}}.$ 



**Input:** The query  $\mathcal{G}_{(g_0,g_1), \mathsf{aggs}(v_0,v_1)}(\mathbb{R}^0 \Join_k \mathbb{R}^1)$ .  $\mathcal{P}_0$  inputs  $\mathcal{V}_0 =$  $(\pi_0, \langle E \rangle_0^{\mathsf{b}}, \mathsf{J}^{\mathsf{o}})$ .  $\mathcal{P}_1$  inputs  $\mathcal{V}_1 = (\pi_1, \langle E \rangle_1^{\mathsf{b}}, \mathsf{J}^1)$ , W.L.O.G. we assume  $|\pi_0| = |\pi_1| = n$ . **Protocol:** 

- 1)  $\mathcal{P}_1$  generates a length-*m* permutation  $\sigma_b$  such that for  $i \in$  $[m-1], \ J^{1}_{\sigma_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{i})}[g_{1}] \leq J^{1}_{\sigma_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{i}+1)}[g_{1}].$
- 2)  $\mathcal{P}_1$  computes and shares  $\mathbf{T}^{(1)} = \sigma_b \cdot \mathbf{J}^1$ .
- 3) Invoke  $P_{\text{osn}}^{s}$  and append results into  $T^{(1)},$  where  $\mathcal{P}_{1}$  acts as receiver with input  $\sigma_b$ .  $(\langle T^{(1)}[e] \rangle^b, \langle T^{(1)}[g_0] \rangle, \langle T^{(1)}[v_0] \rangle) \leftarrow$  $\mathsf{P}^{\mathsf{s}}_{\mathsf{osn}}(\sigma_b, (\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{J}^{\mathsf{0}}[g_0] \rangle, \langle \mathsf{J}^{\mathsf{0}}[v_0] \rangle)).$
- Run stable sorting  $(\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle, (\langle T^{(2)}[e] \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle T^{(2)}[g_0] \rangle))$  $\leftarrow$  $\begin{array}{l} P_{\mathtt{sSort}}(\langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}[e]\rangle^{\mathtt{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}[g_0]\rangle). \\ \text{5) Compute } \langle \mathsf{T}^{(2)}\rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}^{s}_{\mathtt{perm}}(\langle \pi_{g_0}\rangle, \langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}\rangle). \end{array}$
- 6) Compute valid flag  $F: \langle f_i \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} = \langle \mathsf{T} \\ (\neg \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{eq}}(\langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[g_0] || \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle \mathsf{T}_{i+1}^{(2)}[g_0] || \mathsf{T}_{i+1}^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle)).$  $\langle {\tt T}_{\tt i}^{(2)}[e] \rangle^{\tt b}$   $\odot$
- 7) Init  $\langle \mathbf{T}^{(3)} \rangle = \emptyset$  and compute for  $u \in \{0, 1\}$ : a)  $\langle \mathbf{T}^{(3)}[r_u] \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{trav}}(\langle \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[g_0] || \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[v_u] \rangle, \mathsf{agg}_u).$
- b) For  $i \in [n]$ :  $\langle \mathsf{T}_{i}^{(3)}[g_{u}] \rangle = \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{mux}}(\langle f_{i} \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}_{i}^{(2)}[g_{u}] \rangle, \langle \bot \rangle), \langle \mathsf{T}_{i}^{(3)}[r_{u}] \rangle = \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{mux}}(\langle f_{i} \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}_{i}^{(2)}[r_{u}] \rangle, \langle \bot \rangle).$
- 8) Invoke  $P_{osn}^{s}$  with  $\mathcal{P}_{0}$  inputs a random permutation  $\alpha$ :  $\langle T^{(4)} \rangle \leftarrow$  $P_{osn}^{s}(\alpha, \langle T^{(3)} \rangle).$

**Output:** Reveal  $\langle T^{(4)} \rangle$  to  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .



refreshing is partially free. Due to space limitations, please refer to Appendix. B for details.

## V. GROUP AGGREGATION PROTOCOLS

In this section, we describe our GA protocols that perform on our proposed view  $\mathcal{V}$ . As mentioned in §II-D1, the input of GA is plaintext due to the payload-independence feature that our view design brings. It allows subsequent procedures to be optimized, e.g., heavy oblivious sorting can be partially replaced by local sorting. We describe our protocols for secure evaluating the query  $\mathcal{G}_{(g_0,g_1),\mathrm{aggs}(v_0,v_1)}(\mathbb{R}^0 \Join_k \mathbb{R}^1)$  in different cases <sup>1</sup>. Then, we discuss their complexity and illustrate how to further optimize protocols for some special cases.

# A. Optimized Sorting-based GA Protocol Posorting

When running a GA query grouping by  $g_0, g_1$ , tuples that belong to the same group need to be grouped together in an oblivious way to conduct aggregation over them. A widely used way of oblivious grouping is oblivious sorting. Previous sorting-based work requires sorting over both  $g_0, g_1$  and incurs significant overhead [13], [31]. Our observation is that when the input is plaintext, the input length of the sorting protocol can be reduced by introducing an oblivious stable sorting.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For count,  $v_0$  or  $v_1$  will be set to vector of 1s to enable aggregation.

	k g <sub>0</sub> v	<sub>0</sub> k g <sub>1</sub> v <sub>1</sub>	$\sigma_{b}$	кg	<b>I</b> 1 V1		I	kξ	<b>j</b> <sub>0</sub> V <sub>0</sub>		k	<b>g</b> 0	v <sub>0</sub> e	e	$\pi_{g}$	0	е	go	91	V <sub>0</sub>	v <sub>1</sub>				$\mathbf{r}_{0}$	<b>r</b> 1		<b>g</b> o !	<b>g</b> 1	$\mathbf{r}_0$	$\mathbf{r}_1$		<b>g</b> 0	g1	$\mathbf{r}_0$	<b>r</b> <sub>1</sub>
1	k4 a 4	k4 y 40	3	k2 :	x 20	] [:	I [	k4	a 4		k2	а	2 1	L	5	]	0	b	у	3	70		0		3	70		T	T	T	Т		$\perp$	T	Т	T
1	k6 b 6	k6 y 60	5	k1 :	x 10	:	L	k6	b 6		k1	а	1 1	L	1		1	а	х	2	20		0		2	20		1	т	+	Ŧ		а	х	3	20
1	k2 a 2	k2 x 20 (1	) 1 (2)	k4	y 40		L	k2	a 2	(3)	k4	а	4 1	(4)	2	(5)	1	а	х	1	10	(6)	1	(7a)	3	20	(7b)	а	х	3	20	(8)	b	у	11	60
0	k3 b 3	k7 y 70	2	k6	y 60		)    I	k3	b 3	Τ	k6	b	6 1	L 🖵	3	Г	1	а	у	4	40		1		4	40	$\rightarrow$	a	y	4	40		$\perp$	$\bot$	Ŧ	T
1	k1 a 1	k1 x 10	4	k7	y 70		L	k1	a 1		k3	b	3 (	)	4		1	b	у	6	60		0		6	60		т	T	т	Ŧ		а	y	4	40
1	k5 b 5	k5 y 50	6	k5	y 50		L	k5	b 5		k5	b	5 1	L	6		1	b	у	5	50		1		11	60		b	у	11	60		T	T	Т	L
⟨E	) J <sup>0</sup>	J <sup>1</sup>	<u> </u>	(T <sup>(</sup>	<sup>1)</sup>	(E	E)		0		(	T <sup>(1</sup>	))					(	T <sup>(2</sup>	))			(F	)	{	Г <sup>(3)</sup>	)		(Т	<sup>(3)</sup>			d	<b>(</b> T	(4)	)

Fig. 7: A running example of  $P_{\text{sorting}}$  (Fig. 6), where the aggregate functions are  $\text{sum}(v_0), \max(v_1)$  and  $\mathbb{D}^{g_0} = \{a, b\}, \mathbb{D}^{g_1} = \{x, y\}$ .

Input: Same as Fig. 6. Protocol After step 2 of Fig. 6:

- 3) The parties invoke  $P_{osn}^{s}$  and append results into  $T^{(1)}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as receiver with input  $\sigma_b$ .  $(\langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}[e] \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}[g_0] \rangle) \leftarrow$  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathsf{s}}_{\mathsf{osn}}(\sigma_b, (\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{J}^{\mathsf{o}}[g_0] \rangle)).$
- 4) Invoke stable sorting:  $(\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle, (\langle \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[e] \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[g_0] \rangle))$  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathtt{sSort}}(\langle \mathtt{T}^{(1)}[e]\rangle^{\mathtt{b}}, \langle \mathtt{T}^{(1)}[g_0]\rangle).$
- 5) The parties invoke  $P_{perm}^{p}$  with  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as sender, and append results into  $T^{(2)}$ :  $(\langle T^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle T^{(2)}[v_1] \rangle, \langle \rho \rangle) \leftarrow P_{perm}^{p}(\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle, (T^{(1)}[g_1], T^{(1)}[v_1], \sigma_b)).$
- 6) The parties invoke  $P_{perm}^{p}$  and append results into  $T^{(2)}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{0}$  acts as sender:  $\langle T^{(2)}[v_{0}] \rangle \leftarrow P_{perm}^{p}(\langle \rho \rangle, J^{0}[v_{0}]).$

Then: Run the remainder after step 5 in Fig. 6.

Fig. 8: Optimized sorting-based GA protocol PoSorting.

We give a first-attempt sorting-based GA protocol P<sub>sorting</sub> in Fig.6 that simply utilizes stable sorting and then shows further optimizations.

1) Protocol details: Since the input of GA is plaintext due to payload-independence of  $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{P}_1$  can first sort his relation  $J^1$ based on grouping attribute  $g_1$  and obtain the permutation  $\sigma_b$ . Then, we can obtain  $T^1$  in the order of  $g_1$  by applying  $\sigma_b$  on  $J^0$  and  $J^1$ . Next, parties perform stable sorting  $P_{sSort}$  based on e and  $g_0$  to obtain a secret-shared permutation  $\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle$ , then invoke  $P_{perm}^s$  to apply  $\pi_{q_0}$  on  $T^{(1)}$ . As a result,  $T^{(2)}$  is sorted in the lexicographic order of attributes  $e, g_0, g_1$ , where the tuples not belonging to the join result will be sorted to the front, and all valid tuples within the same group will be sorted together.

After sorting, the parties compute the valid flag F representing whether the corresponding tuple is the last valid tuple of its group. Then, in step 7(a), the oblivious traversal is performed on shared values of attributes  $v_0, v_1$  to obtain the aggregation result. After that,  $T_i^{(3)}[r_u]$  with  $f_i = 1$  stores the aggregate result over the tuples within the same group. To hide the number of tuples in each group,  $T^{(3)}$  must be randomly shuffled. Since the result will be revealed to  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , one invocation of  $P_{osn}$  with  $\mathcal{P}_0$  as receiver is enough. A running example is shown in Fig.7.

2) Further Optimizations: Performing shared permutation  $P_{\text{nerm}}^s$  over a shared vector  $\langle X \rangle$  is expensive since it would invoke OSN for 4 times as mentioned in §III-C. We note that applying a shared permutation on a plain vector owned by one party is more lightweight. We denote it as  $\mathtt{P}_{\mathtt{perm}}^{\mathtt{p}}$  and describe the protocol in Appendix. C. It only calls OSN 2 times and has nearly half the communication cost compared with P<sup>s</sup><sub>perm</sub>. Then, we optimize the above protocol using  $P_{perm}^{p}$  instead of  $P_{nerm}^{s}$  as shown in Fig. 8, and obtain the final optimized sortingbased GA protocol PoSorting. The correctness is guaranteed by the associative law of permutation.

In addition, we observe that apart from  $P_{mux}$ , the core operation in the underlying protocols of Ptrav for sum/count is just local addition due to the property of additive secret sharing.

Considering the aggregation result will be revealed directly, the aggregation can be further optimized to avoid prefix operation of  $O(\log n)$  rounds. Taking sum as an example, the protocol can be modified as follows:

- 1) Replace the computation in step 6:  $\langle f_i \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} = \langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[e] \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} \odot (\neg \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{eq}}(\langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[g_0] || \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle \mathsf{T}_{i-1}^{(2)}[g_0] || \mathsf{T}_{i-1}^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle)).$ 2) Replace step 7(a) with:  $i \in [n]$ :  $\langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(3)}[r_u] \rangle =$
- $\sum_{i=i}^{n} \langle \mathsf{T}_{i}^{(2)}[v_{u}] \rangle.$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  needs to perform additional computation after revealing  $T^{(4)}$ .  $\mathcal{P}_1$  picks out the tuples in  $T^{(4)}$  whose values of  $g_0, g_1$  are not  $\perp$ , and sorts those tuples based on the lexicographical order of  $g_0, g_1$  into R. Then,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  updates  $\mathbf{R}_{i}[r_{u}] = (\mathbf{R}_{i}[r_{u}] - \mathbf{R}_{i+1}[r_{u}]) \text{ for } 1 \leq i < |\mathbf{R}|, j \in \{0, 1\}$ as the result of sum. In this way, the communication round of step 7 can be reduced into O(1). This optimization can also be applied to  $P_{bSorting}$  and  $P_{mix}$  for group-sum/count.

# B. Bitmap-assisted Sorting-based GA Protocol Pusorting

In §V-A, we improved oblivious sorting with stable sorting of shorter input since  $q_1$  is plaintext. We observed that when  $g_0$  is also plaintext, we can exploit the input cardinality to optimize the oblivious stable sorting further. To achieve this, we first propose an efficient stable sorting protocol  $P_{\texttt{bitSort}}$ . It inputs a secret-shared bitmap, which is d length-n binary shared vectors  $\langle B^1 \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \ldots, \langle B^d \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$  satisfying  $\forall i \in [n]$ :  $\sum_{i=1}^{d} b_i^j \in \{0,1\}$ , and outputs a length-*n* shared permutation  $\pi$ .  $\pi$  represents a stable sorting of  $\langle B^1 \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \ldots, \langle B^d \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$ , such that the *i*<sup>th</sup> elements should be placed into  $\pi(i)^{th}$  position in the sorted result. The protocol is shown in Fig. 10. It takes O(1) rounds and  $O(dn \log n)$  bits of communications, where  $\log n$  is the bit length to represent the values in a length-n permutation. Correctness and security follow from the radix sort protocol in the three-party setting [33].

Based on P<sub>bitSort</sub>, we propose our bitmap-assisted sortingbased protocol P<sub>bSorting</sub>. The main difference compared to  $P_{oSorting}$  is that the stable sorting of  $g_0$  is conducted with its bitmap encoding and PbitSort. We defer the detailed description to Appendix. D due to space limitations.

Fig. 9: Bitmap-based GA protocol P <sub>bi</sub>	tmap
--	------

**Input:** Length-*n* vectors  $\langle B^1 \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \ldots, \langle B^d \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$ with  $\forall i$  $\in$ [n]:  $\sum_{j=1}^{d} b_i^j \in \{0, 1\}.$ **Protocol:** 1) Initialize  $\langle a \rangle = 0$ , length-*n* vector  $\langle V \rangle = (\langle 0 \rangle, \dots, \langle 0 \rangle)$ . 2) Compute  $\langle B^{d+1} \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} : \langle b_i^{d+1} \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} = \neg \bigoplus_{j=1}^{d} \langle b_i^j \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$  for  $i \in [n]$ . 3) For j = d + 1 to 1: • For i = 1 to n: a)  $\langle a \rangle = \langle a \rangle + \mathbb{P}_{b2A}(\langle b_i^j \rangle^b);$ b)  $\langle v_i \rangle = \langle v_i \rangle + \mathbb{P}_{mux}(\langle b_i^j \rangle^b, \langle a \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle).$ **Output:**  $\langle V \rangle$ .

Fig. 10: New oblivious stable sorting protocol P<sub>bitSort</sub> for secret-shared bitmap input.

## C. Mixed GA Protocol P<sub>mix</sub>

The ideas of previous protocols are based on oblivious sorting to divide groups. We observe that the grouping can also be achieved by using a bitmap since each bit-vector of the bitmap naturally specifies a distinct group value. To obtain the aggregation result for each group divided by two grouping attributes  $g_0, g_1$ , we can first divide the tuples into groups based on  $g_0$  by using a bitmap, and then perform the GA based on  $g_1$  over each group specified by bit-vectors of  $g_0$ 's bitmap. In this way, the oblivious sorting can be replaced by the bitmap encoding. As a trade-off, the  $P_{trav}$  should be invoked for  $d_0$ times for each distinct group of  $g_0$ . By mixing the use of bitmap (for  $g_0$ ) and local sorting (for  $g_1$ ), we present our mixed protocol in Fig.11.

First,  $\mathcal{P}_0$  generates the bitmap of  $g_0$ , where each bit-vector represents whether the input tuples belong to a specific group of  $g_0$ . After step 2,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  locally sorts  $J^1$  based on  $g_1$ , and computes the group indicator C representing the boundary of groups divided with  $g_1$ . Then,  $P_{mux}$  is invoked to set the values that do not belong to the current group of  $g_0$  as  $\perp$  to eliminate their effect. Finally, the aggregation result of groups based on  $g_0, g_1$  can be obtained by invoking  $P_{trav}$ . Such that for  $i \in [n]$ and  $j \in [d_0]$ ,  $\mathsf{T}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(2)}[r_u^j]$  stores the aggregation result of group  $\mathbb{D}_{j}^{g_0}||\mathsf{T}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(1)}[g_1]$  if  $c_i = 1$ , and  $\mathsf{T}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(2)}[r_u^j] = \bot$  otherwise.

# D. Bitmap-based GA Protocol P<sub>bitmap</sub>

We propose  $P_{bitmap}$  to optimize GA for cases where  $d_0d_1$  is small by encoding both  $g_0, g_1$  as bitmaps, the details of which are illustrated in Fig. 9. The idea is to divide distinct groups of

#### Input: Same as Fig. 6. **Protocol:**

- 1)  $\mathcal{P}_0$  generates bitmaps of  $g_0$  in  $J^0$ : { $J^0[b^1], \ldots, J^0[b^{d_0}]$ }.
- 2) The parties run steps 1-3 in Fig. 6, and replace  $J^0[q_0]$  with  $\{J^{0}[\hat{b}^{1}], \ldots, J^{0}[b^{d_{0}}]\}$  in step 3.
- 3)  $\mathcal{P}_1$  locally computes and shares the group indicator C.  $\forall i \in$ [n]:  $c_i = ind(T_1^1[g_1] \neq T_{1+1}^1[g_1])$ . 4) The parties initialize  $\langle T^2 \rangle = \emptyset$ , and process in parallel for
- $u \in \{0, 1\}, j \in [d_0]$ :
  - a) The parties compute a temporal vectors A for  $i \in [n]$ :

 $\begin{array}{l} \langle a_i \rangle = \mathsf{P}_{\mathtt{mux}}(\langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(1)}[e] \rangle^{\mathtt{b}} \odot \langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(1)}[b^j] \rangle^{\mathtt{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(1)}[v_u] \rangle, \langle \bot \rangle). \\ \mathsf{b}) \ \langle \mathsf{T}^{(2)}[r_u^j] \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{\mathtt{trav}}(\langle \mathsf{T}^{(1)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle A \rangle, \mathtt{agg}_u). \\ \mathsf{c}) \ \mathrm{For} \ i \in [n]: \ \langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[r_u^j] \rangle = \mathsf{P}_{\mathtt{mux}}(\langle c_i \rangle^{\mathtt{b}}, \langle \mathsf{T}_i^{(2)}[r_u^j] \rangle, \langle \bot \rangle). \end{array}$ **Output:** Reveal  $\langle T^2 \rangle$  to  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .



 $g_0, g_1$  via the bit-vectors of bitmaps, so any oblivious sorting or functions that require OSN (such as  $P_{shuffle}$  or  $P_{perm}^{s}$ ) are totally avoided. The cost is additional aggregatoin processes of  $d_0d_1$  times, so it is more efficient in small  $d_0d_1$  cases, which we will confirm in §VI.

The round complexity of  $P_{bitmap}$  depends on the type of aggregation. When agg is sum or count, the aggregation is  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\text{mux}}(\langle e_i \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle q_i \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle)$  and can be calculated in one round. When agg is max or min, the computation can be performed via binary-tree-based method [36], [49] that simply invokes O(n) times of comparison in  $O(\log n)$  rounds.

# E. Complexity Analysis

let n be the size of the view  $\mathcal{V}, l_v^0, l_v^1, (l_a^0, l_a^1)$  be the bit length of values of aggregation attributes  $v_0, v_1$  (grouping keys  $g_0, g_1$ ) respectively.  $l_v = l_v^0 + l_v^1, l_g = l_g^0 + l_g^1, l = l_v + l_g$ . We analyze the communication complexity of our GA protocols in Tab. I.

For sorting-relevant protocols PoSorting and PbSorting, oblivious sorting is the most expensive process. Specifically,  $\mathtt{P}_{\tt sSort}$ takes the communication cost of  $O(n \log^2 n (l_q^1 + \log n))$ bits and  $O(\log^2 n \log(l_g^1 + \log n))$  rounds, and  $P_{\texttt{bitSort}}$  takes  $O(d_0 n \log n)$  bits and O(1) rounds.  $P_{perm}^p$  and  $P_{invp}^p$  takes O(1)rounds and  $O(nk \log n)$  bits communication, where k is the input bit length. For max/min,  $P_{trav}$  takes  $O(\log n \log l_v)$  rounds and  $O(nl_v)$  bits of communication. Thus, the communication cost of the  $P_{oSorting}$  and  $P_{bSorting}$  are  $O(n \log n(l_q^1 \log n + l + l_q))$  $\log^2 n$ ) bits and  $O(n \log n(d_0 + l + \log n))$  bits, and their round complexities are dominated by  $P_{sSort}$  and  $P_{trav}$  respectively.

 $P_{mix}$  invokes  $P_{osn}^{p}$  once, and  $P_{trav}$  and  $P_{mux}$  for  $O(d_0)$  times, resulting the cost of  $O(n \log n(d_0 + l + \log n))$  bits. The round complexity is also dominated by the aggregate functions.

For  $P_{\text{bitmap}}$ , the communication grows linearly with  $d_0$  and  $d_1$ , and the aggregation (step 2) can be computed in parallel, which takes O(1) rounds for sum/count and  $O(\log n \log l_n)$ rounds for max/min.

## F. Further Discussion

1) Discussion for one-side case: For the special case where the grouping attributes are owned by one party, e.g.,  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , a single invocation of OSN satisfies to achieve oblivious

Pto.	Comm. cost (bits)	Comm. Rounds
PoSorting	$O(n\log n(l_g^1\log n + l + \log^2 n))$	$O(\log^2 n \log(l_g^1 + \log n))$
PbSorting	$O(n\log n(d_0 + l + \log n))$	$O(1) / O(\log n \log l_v)$
Pmix	$O(n\log n(d_0+l_v^0)+nd_0l_v)$	$O(1) / O(\log n \log l_v)$
Pbitmap	$O(d_0d_1nl_v)$	$O(1) / O(\log n \log l_v)$

TABLE I: Theoretically complexity of our protocols. The communication rounds of some protocols depend on agg, which are O(1) for sum/count and  $O(\log n \log l_v)$  for max/min.

grouping. Specifically,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  can locally sort his table based on  $g_1$  to obtain  $\pi$ , then permute the remaining payload based on  $\pi$  by invoking an OSN. In this case,  $P_{oSorting}$ ,  $P_{bSorting}$  and  $P_{mix}$  behave the same and the oblivious sorting (*e.g.*, steps 4-5 in Fig. 6) can be removed, reducing the communication cost to  $O(n \log n l_v^0 + n l_v)$  bits. We denote this protocol as one-side version of  $P_{oSorting}$ .

2) Discussion for PK-FK join: Obviously, the difference of views for PK-PK join and PK-FK join is whether  $J^0$  is secretly shared. Thus, the above optimization of replacing  $P_{perm}^s$  with  $P_{perm}^p$  can not be used. Also, for the bitmap-assisted or mixed protocol, the bitmap vectors of  $g_0$  should be appended to  $\mathbb{R}^0$  before the view generation or refresh.

# VI. IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

In this section, we demonstrate the evaluation results of MapComp. Specially, we address the following questions:

- Question-1: Does our proposed materialized view offer efficiency advantages of view operations over existing non-view work?
- **Question-2:** Does our proposed GA protocols outperform the traditional bitonic-based solution? Which GA protocol should one use in a given setting?
- Question-3: Does MapComp scale to large-scale datasets and real-world queries? To what extent can MapComp enhance over the non-view JGA baseline?

# A. Experimental Setups

**Implementation and configuration.** We implemented the prototype of MapComp based on Java with JDK16. We evaluated our protocols on two physical machines with Intel<sup>®</sup> Core<sup>TM</sup> i9-9900K 3.60GHz CPU and 128GB RAM. The number of available threads for each party is 15. The experimental network settings include LAN (2.5Gbps bandwidth) and WAN (100Mbps bandwidth with 40ms RTT latency). We precompute the multiplication triples used in MPC offline and include this portion of time in the total time. The size of join keys and aggregation attributes is fixed at 64 bits. For GA protocols, we evaluate the most time-consuming case where the group attributes come from two parties and the aggregation attributes all come from  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . For the private set operations, we use the state-of-the-art (SOTA) protocols to instantiate PSI [50], PID [29] and circuit PSI (CPSI) [48], respectively.

**Queries.** We use 4 real-world JGA queries from wideadopted TPC-H benchmark [51] to evaluate our framework. Since the performance of our secure protocols is only relevant to the data size and independent of data values, the dataset is generated randomly under specified settings in all experiments

	View Operations	Vie	w Gener	ation	View Refresh						
Ptos.	Len. of Payload(bits)	$2^{4}$	26	2 <sup>8</sup>	24	26	28				
	Baseline (CPSI)	270.5	271.7	272.3	270.5	271.7	272.3				
PK-PK	Ours (PpsiV)	5.3	5.3	5.3	0	0	0				
	Ours (PpidV)	353.2	353.2	353.2	0	0	0				
	Ours (PsecV)	962.2	962.2	962.2	0	0	0				
	Baseline (CPSI + $P_{trav}$ )	302.2	315.6	364.9	302.1	314.2	363.2				
PK-FK	Ours (PpsiV + Ptrav)	30.5	37.4	85.0	21.7	27.3	75.9				
INTR	Ours (PpidV + Ptrav)	391.2	407.4	451.2	32.6	46.8	95.1				
	Ours $(P_{secV} + P_{trav})$	944.2	953.4	1,000.9	21.6	28.5	76.6				

TABLE II: Execution time (s) of view operations with fixed input size  $n = 2^{20}$  in LAN setting.

while ensuring that no constraints are violated. We assume tables "customer" and "orders" are from one party, "lineitem" from the other party, and "nation" is a public table.

# B. Performance Gain of View Operations

We answer Question-1 by comparing the execution time of our approaches and the baseline for the view generation and refresh. We set the baseline of PK-PK and PK-FK join as SOTA CPSI [48] and CPSI with additional oblivious payload duplication via  $P_{trav}$ , respectively. The ideas behind this setting were proposed in [52] for SGX and [22] in the threeparty setting, and we instantiate them in the two-party setting with CPSI. We evaluated the experiment in the LAN setting with the databases containing  $2^{20}$  tuples and  $2^{10}$  update tuples (for view refresh). The results are summarized in Table II. Since view generation is a one-time task (*e.g.*, can be precomputed offline) and refresh is more frequently invoked in online tasks, our focus is the efficiency of view refresh.

We observe that our protocols significantly outperform the baseline in view refresh. For the PK-PK join, our protocols generate a completely reusable join view. Compared with the baseline which takes around 270s to refresh the view, the only overhead of our approach is memory IO to access and modify existing tuples, making it extremely efficient with less than 1 millisecond time, and we ignore it in our statistics. For the PK-FK join view, our approaches are partially refresh-free with little MPC operation, *e.g.*, P<sub>osn</sub> and P<sub>trav</sub>. Compared with the baseline, which always requires a complete re-construction of the view when refreshed, our PK-FK provides a performance edge of up to  $13.9 \times$ . This result further demonstrates the necessity of adopting view-based JGA framework.

Our experiment also demonstrates that our view generation protocols provide a privacy-efficiency trade-off. Level-0 security protocol (*e.g.*, ours with  $P_{psiv}$ ) that with bounded leakage gives the best efficiency, up to  $9.9 \times$  compared with the baseline. This is because the computation only involves the join key while the baseline requires inputting the whole tuple. Users have the flexibility to choose the most appropriate protocol to achieve their desired efficiency or privacy goals.

#### C. Efficiency Comparison of GA Protocols

We address Question-2 by evaluating our GA protocols over databases with different data sizes and various group cardinalities. We set the widely used bitonic sorting-based approach [10], [12]–[14] with secret-shared input  $g_0, g_1$  as the baseline. The results for cases of *equal* and *unequal* group cardinality are shown in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 respectively. In *equal* cases,  $d_0 = d_1$  and ranges from  $2^2$  to  $2^8$ , while  $d_1$  is fixed to  $2^{64}$  in *unequal* cases. Based on the result, we obtain the following conclusions that show the performance gain of our protocols in different cases.

For equal group cardinality cases shown in Fig. 12, our best approach is  $3.5 \times \sim 1140.5 \times$  faster than the baseline. This is because our GA protocols enjoy the plaintext input brought by our view and can leverage the nature of data for acceleration. Specifically, when the group cardinality  $d = |\mathbb{D}^g|$  is small  $(e.g., 2^2)$ , P<sub>bitmap</sub> achieves the best efficiency for group-bysum due to its total avoidance of oblivious sorting. As the cardinality increases, the linear overhead of  $P_{\text{bitmap}}(O(d_0d_1))$ dominates the cost, and  $P_{mix}$  performs the best after  $2^3$ . For the comparison of  $P_{\tt mix}$  and  $P_{\tt bSorting},$  as shown in Tab. I, the complexity related to  $d_0$  are  $n \log n$  and  $n (\log n + l_v)$ respectively, which means that the overhead of the Pmix increases faster as  $d_0$  increases. Thus, our evaluation confirms that  $P_{bSorting}$  outperforms after  $d = 2^7$ . For group-by-max, the aggregation phase relies on a heavy pairwise comparison [37] and dominates the cost. Thus, the protocols that require a linear time aggregation (Pbitmap and Pmix) have no advantage when d is larger than  $2^2$ . In this case, our P<sub>bSorting</sub> is always faster than others. This is because the size of inputs and the efficiency of sorting algorithm are the main parts impacting the running time for these sorting-based protocols. The outperform of P<sub>bSorting</sub> over the baseline is due to the reduction of the size of sorting input that our view brings, and the outperform over P<sub>oSorting</sub> is due to the improvement of our P<sub>bitSort</sub>.

A similar observation can be learned from the unequal group cardinality cases shown in Fig. 13. It demonstrates that  $P_{bSorting}$  and  $P_{oSorting}$  are much more efficient than the baseline in all cases, up to  $29.3 \times$  improvements. This is because the oblivious sorting with relatively large input  $(d_1 = 2^{64})$  is optimized by local sorting. As the complexity of  $P_{bSorting}$  is also linear with  $d_0$ ,  $P_{oSorting}$  is more efficient when  $d_0$  is large. For the comparison of the baseline and  $P_{oSorting}$ , we note the bit length of input for the sorting process of them are  $l_{g_0} + l_{g_1}$  and  $\min(l_{g_0}, l_{g_1}) + \log n$  respectively. Thus,  $P_{oSorting}$  outperforms in the cases where  $\max(l_{g_0}, l_{g_1})$  is relatively large when n is fixed, as confirmed in Fig. 13. We evaluated more precisely the execution time of the baseline vs.  $P_{oSorting}$  for different cases of  $l_g$  on group-sum in Tab. III, and observe that the baseline falls short after  $l_g = 8$ .

Bit Len. of $g(l_g)$	2	4	8	16	32	64
Ratio	0.72	0.85	1.04	1.28	1.52	1.71

TABLE III: The ratio of the execution time of the baseline vs.  $P_{oSorting}$  group-sum protocol when  $n = 2^{20}$ .

Next, based on the complexity analysis and evaluation results, we answer the second part of Question-2. That is, which GA protocol performs best in a given setting? Our analysis gives the following guidelines for representative dataset size  $(2^{20})$  in the LAN setting.

- When  $d_0, d_1$  are both smaller than  $2^3$  and aggregation function is sum, P<sub>bitmap</sub> is the best among all approaches.
- Apart from the above case, when d<sub>0</sub> or d<sub>1</sub> is less than 2<sup>7</sup> and aggregation function is sum, one should use P<sub>mix</sub>.
- Apart from the above cases, when  $d_0$  or  $d_1$  is less than  $2^{12}$ , we should use P<sub>bSorting</sub>.
- When  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  are both large than  $2^{12}$ , we should choose  $P_{oSorting}$ .

# D. Real-world Queries Simulation

To answer Question-3, we simulated the real-world applications with queries from the TPC-H benchmark and evaluated the overall execution time of MapComp in both LAN and WAN environments. We treat the join process as a materialized join view generation process and select the CPSI +  $P_{trav}$  and  $P_{psiV}$  +  $P_{trav}$  as the baseline and our approach, respectively. For GA, we chose  $P_{oSorting}$  for Q3 and the one-side version of  $P_{oSorting}$  for Q10, Q11, and Q12 as our approach. The choice is based on the guidelines we proposed in §VI-C and the nature of the queries that the group attributes all from one side. We set the baseline of GA as the traditional bitonic sorting approach similar to §VI-C. We compared the execution time of online and offline (*e.g.*, multiplication triples generation used in MPC) and presented the result in Fig. 14.

From the result of Q3 in the LAN setting, we observe that our approach gives  $2.49 \times$  overall time speed up over the baseline. It is mainly because the shorter input of PoSorting requires fewer multiplication triples used in oblivious sorting, the generation of which is a time-consuming task. A similar observation can be drawn from the WAN setting, the overall performance gain is  $1.8 \times$  and  $2.4 \times$  for online and total execution, respectively. For the other 3 queries, the online (and total) execution of our protocol is  $2.0 \times \sim 4.2 \times$  (and  $75.1 \times \sim 2042.7 \times$ ) faster than the baseline in the LAN setting, and  $2.4 \times \sim 25.1 \times$  (and  $39.5 \times \sim 1016.7 \times$ ) faster in the WAN setting. This is because our protocol is sorting-free in the one-side case due to the plaintext brought by our view. The evaluation result demonstrates the great advantage of our GA protocol over the traditional bitonic sorting-based one in realworld queries, yielding up to  $2042.7 \times$  efficiency improvement.

Num.	Q3	Q10	Q11	Q12
2	2.5	1693.4	155	61.6
4	2.5	2167.6	172.5	81.5
6	2.5	2182.4	173	82.3
8	2.5	2189.9	173.2	82.7

TABLE IV: The ratio of the total execution time of baseline vs. MapComp when querying multiple times in LAN setting. Num. denotes the number of JGA queries.

To confirm the performance gain of our view-based framework, we simulated a real-world query scenario for JGA. Assuming the above TPC-H database can be updated dynamically, we conducted multiple JGA queries on them in the LAN setting, where the first query involves a view generation and subsequent queries require only an on-demand view refresh. The setting of the query, the baseline, and our approaches are





the same as above. We quantified the ratio of the execution time between the baseline and MapComp in Tab. IV. As the number of queries increases, the efficiency advantage of MapComp grows more obvious, achieving up to  $2189.9 \times$  efficiency improvement over the baseline. Similar trends can be observed in all queries. We primarily attribute this to our

more efficient GA protocols and view refreshing compared to the baseline. This result confirms the greater improvements of MapComp in cases of multiple queries.

#### VII. RELATED WORK

**MPC-based collaborative analytics systems.** General MPC, including secret sharing [53] and garbled circuit [54], are widely used to compute the specific functions among mutually distrustful parties, and many MPC-based collaborative analytics systems have been proposed in recent years. SMCQL series [2], [20] is one of the earliest database systems that target privacy for collaborative queries under the MPC model using garbled circuit and ORAM [55]. Conclave [11] extends the secure query processing to spark. Senate [10] proposed a decomposition protocol to decompose MPC computation into paralleled-executed smaller units and provided security against malicious parties. Scape [13] and SECRECY [31] are built on

three computing parties and provide dedicated algorithms for common SQL operations such as join and aggregation.

**Private set operation-based approaches.** A rich body of work exists on custom protocols for private set operations, *e.g.*, PSI [45], [56], PSU [57], [58], Private ID [29], [46], and Circuit PSI [44], [47]. There are also many works aiming at specific functionalities over the result of the set operation [59]–[61]. For example, Secure Yannakakis [12] supports collaborative join-aggregate queries with strong assumptions, which limits its use cases. PJC [5] focuses on join-aggregate queries for the case that the data sizes are unbalanced.

**Enclave-based approaches.** Many collaborative analytics systems [62]–[64] rely on trusted hardware enclave. Enclave-based approaches process data in plain within a physically protected environment (*e.g.*, Intel SGX), so they typically achieve better performance than MPC. However, enclaves require additional trust assumptions and suffer from side-channel attacks [65], [66].

# VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper proposed MapComp, a novel view-based framework aimed at facilitating secure JGA queries. By employing a specially crafted materialized view, MapComp pre-computes and re-uses duplicated, heavy workloads of join to enhance overall execution speed. Additionally, the materialized view enjoys payload independence, enabling further optimization of GA protocols, outperforming existing methods in various scenarios. Looking ahead, we aim to expand our framework to accommodate more general scenarios involving multiple data owners and incremental databases. Furthermore, we intend to incorporate support for malicious-secure MPC against active adversaries in collaborative analytics.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ion, B. Kreuter, A. E. Nergiz, S. Patel, S. Saxena, K. Seth, M. Raykova, D. Shanahan, and M. Yung, "On deploying secure computing: Private intersection-sum-with-cardinality," in *IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2020, Genoa, Italy, September 7-11, 2020.* IEEE, 2020, pp. 370–389.
- [2] J. Bater, G. Elliott, C. Eggen, S. Goel, A. N. Kho, and J. Rogers, "Smcql: Secure query processing for private data networks." *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 673–684, 2017.
- [3] A. Sangers, M. van Heesch, T. Attema, T. Veugen, M. Wiggerman, J. Veldsink, O. Bloemen, and D. Worm, "Secure multiparty pagerank algorithm for collaborative fraud detection," in *Financial Cryptography* and Data Security - 23rd International Conference, FC 2019, Frigate Bay, St. Kitts and Nevis, February 18-22, 2019, Revised Selected Papers, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, I. Goldberg and T. Moore, Eds., vol. 11598. Springer, 2019, pp. 605–623.
- [4] P. Fent, A. Birler, and T. Neumann, "Practical planning and execution of groupjoin and nested aggregates," *The VLDB Journal*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1165–1190, 2023.
- [5] T. Lepoint, S. Patel, M. Raykova, K. Seth, and N. Trieu, "Private join and compute from PIR with default," in Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2021 - 27th International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Singapore, December 6-10, 2021, Proceedings, Part II, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, M. Tibouchi and H. Wang, Eds., vol. 13091. Springer, 2021, pp. 605–634. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92075-3\_21
- [6] T. M. Tran and B. S. Lee, "Transformation of continuous aggregation join queries over data streams," in Advances in Spatial and Temporal Databases: 10th International Symposium, SSTD 2007, Boston, MA, USA, July 16-18, 2007. Proceedings 10. Springer, 2007, pp. 330–347.
- [7] N. M. Johnson, J. P. Near, and D. Song, "Towards practical differential privacy for SQL queries," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 526– 539, 2018.
- [8] "General data protection regulation (gdpr)," https://gdpr.eu/tag/gdpr/.
- [9] "Health insurance portability and accountability act (hipaa)," https: //www.cdc.gov/phlp/publications/topic/hipaa.html.
- [10] R. Poddar, S. Kalra, A. Yanai, R. Deng, R. A. Popa, and J. M. Hellerstein, "Senate: A maliciously-secure {MPC} platform for collaborative analytics," in 30th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 21), 2021.
- [11] N. Volgushev, M. Schwarzkopf, B. Getchell, M. Varia, A. Lapets, and A. Bestavros, "Conclave: secure multi-party computation on big data," in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019*, 2019, pp. 1–18.
- [12] Y. Wang and K. Yi, "Secure yannakakis: Join-aggregate queries over private data," *Proceedings of SIGMOD 2021*, 2021.
- [13] F. Han, L. Zhang, H. Feng, W. Liu, and X. Li, "Scape: Scalable collaborative analytics system on private database with malicious security," in 2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE). IEEE, 2022, pp. 1740–1753.
- [14] J. Liagouris, V. Kalavri, M. Faisal, and M. Varia, "Secrecy: Secure collaborative analytics on secret-shared data," arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01048, 2021.
- [15] T. Schneider and M. Zohner, "GMW vs. yao? efficient secure twoparty computation with low depth circuits," in *Financial Cryptography* and Data Security - 17th International Conference, FC 2013, Okinawa, Japan, April 1-5, 2013, Revised Selected Papers, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Sadeghi, Ed., vol. 7859. Springer, 2013, pp. 275–292.
- [16] G. Asharov, Y. Lindell, T. Schneider, and M. Zohner, "More efficient oblivious transfer extensions," *J. Cryptol.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 805–858, 2017.
- [17] D. Demmler, T. Schneider, and M. Zohner, "Aby-a framework for efficient mixed-protocol secure two-party computation." in NDSS, 2015.
- [18] K. Yang, C. Weng, X. Lan, J. Zhang, and X. Wang, "Ferret: Fast extension for correlated OT with small communication," in CCS '20: 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, USA, November 9-13, 2020, J. Ligatti, X. Ou, J. Katz, and G. Vigna, Eds. ACM, 2020, pp. 1607–1626. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3372297.3417276
- [19] N. Chandran, D. Gupta, and A. Shah, "Circuit-psi with linear complexity via relaxed batch opprf," *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 1, pp. 353–372, 2022.

- [20] J. Bater, X. He, W. Ehrich, A. Machanavajjhala, and J. Rogers, "Shrinkwrap: efficient sql query processing in differentially private data federations," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 307–320, 2018.
- [21] J. Bater, Y. Park, X. He, X. Wang, and J. Rogers, "Saqe: practical privacy-preserving approximate query processing for data federations," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 2691–2705, 2020.
- [22] P. Mohassel, P. Rindal, and M. Rosulek, "Fast database joins and PSI for secret shared data," in CCS '20: 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, USA, November 9-13, 2020, J. Ligatti, X. Ou, J. Katz, and G. Vigna, Eds. ACM, 2020, pp. 1271–1287.
- [23] S. Badrinarayanan, S. Das, G. Garimella, S. Raghuraman, and P. Rindal, "Secret-shared joins with multiplicity from aggregation trees," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2022, Los Angeles, CA, USA, November 7-11, 2022*, H. Yin, A. Stavrou, C. Cremers, and E. Shi, Eds. ACM, 2022, pp. 209–222.
- [24] D. Nassimi and S. Sahni, "Bitonic sort on a mesh-connected parallel computer," *IEEE Trans. Computers*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 2–7, 1979.
- [25] D. Srivastava, S. Dar, H. V. Jagadish, and A. Y. Levy, "Answering queries with aggregation using views," in VLDB'96, Proceedings of 22th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, September 3-6, 1996, Mumbai (Bombay), India, T. M. Vijayaraman, A. P. Buchmann, C. Mohan, and N. L. Sarda, Eds. Morgan Kaufmann, 1996, pp. 318– 329.
- [26] A. Silberschatz, H. F. Korth, and S. Sudarshan, "Database system concepts," 2011.
- [27] C. Wang, J. Bater, K. Nayak, and A. Machanavajjhala, "Incshrink: Architecting efficient outsourced databases using incremental MPC and differential privacy," in *SIGMOD '22: International Conference on Management of Data, Philadelphia, PA, USA, June 12 - 17, 2022, Z. G.* Ives, A. Bonifati, and A. E. Abbadi, Eds. ACM, 2022, pp. 818–832.
- [28] P. Valduriez, "Join indices," ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS), vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 218–246, 1987.
- [29] P. Buddhavarapu, A. Knox, P. Mohassel, S. Sengupta, E. Taubeneck, and V. Vlaskin, "Private matching for compute," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2020.
- [30] Y. Lindell, "How to simulate it-a tutorial on the simulation proof technique," *Tutorials on the Foundations of Cryptography: Dedicated* to Oded Goldreich, pp. 277–346, 2017.
- [31] J. Liagouris, V. Kalavri, M. Faisal, and M. Varia, "SECRECY: secure collaborative analytics in untrusted clouds," in 20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, NSDI 2023, Boston, MA, April 17-19, 2023, M. Balakrishnan and M. Ghobadi, Eds. USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 1031–1056. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/liagouris
- [32] P. O'Neil and G. Graefe, "Multi-table joins through bitmapped join indices," ACM SIGMOD Record, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 8–11, 1995.
- [33] G. Asharov, K. Hamada, D. Ikarashi, R. Kikuchi, A. Nof, B. Pinkas, K. Takahashi, and J. Tomida, "Efficient secure three-party sorting with applications to data analysis and heavy hitters," in *Proceedings of the* 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2022, pp. 125–138.
- [34] I. Müller, P. Sanders, A. Lacurie, W. Lehner, and F. Färber, "Cacheefficient aggregation: Hashing is sorting," in *Proceedings of the 2015* ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015, T. K. Sellis, S. B. Davidson, and Z. G. Ives, Eds. ACM, 2015, pp. 1123–1136.
- [35] D. Beaver, "Efficient multiparty protocols using circuit randomization," in Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO'91: Proceedings 11. Springer, 1992, pp. 420–432.
- [36] B. Knott, S. Venkataraman, A. Hannun, S. Sengupta, M. Ibrahim, and L. van der Maaten, "Crypten: Secure multi-party computation meets machine learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 4961–4973, 2021.
- [37] D. Rathee, M. Rathee, N. Kumar, N. Chandran, D. Gupta, A. Rastogi, and R. Sharma, "Cryptflow2: Practical 2-party secure inference," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2020, pp. 325–342.
- [38] P. Mohassel and P. Rindal, "Aby3: A mixed protocol framework for machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference* on Computer and Communications Security, 2018, pp. 35–52.

- [39] P. Mohassel and S. Sadeghian, "How to hide circuits in mpc an efficient framework for private function evaluation," in *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Springer, 2013, pp. 557–574.
- [40] V. E. Beneš, "Optimal rearrangeable multistage connecting networks," Bell system technical journal, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 1641–1656, 1964.
- [41] M. Chase, E. Ghosh, and O. Poburinnaya, "Secret-shared shuffle," in Advances in Cryptology–ASIACRYPT 2020: 26th International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Daejeon, South Korea, December 7–11, 2020, Proceedings, Part III 26. Springer, 2020, pp. 342–372.
- [42] K. Chida, K. Hamada, D. Ikarashi, R. Kikuchi, N. Kiribuchi, and B. Pinkas, "An efficient secure three-party sorting protocol with an honest majority." *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, vol. 2019, p. 695, 2019.
- [43] V. Kolesnikov, R. Kumaresan, M. Rosulek, and N. Trieu, "Efficient batched oblivious prf with applications to private set intersection," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2016, pp. 818–829.
- [44] B. Pinkas, T. Schneider, C. Weinert, and U. Wieder, "Efficient circuitbased psi via cuckoo hashing," in *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Springer, 2018, pp. 125–157.
- [45] M. Chase and P. Miao, "Private set intersection in the internet setting from lightweight oblivious prf," in Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO 2020: 40th Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2020, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 17–21, 2020, Proceedings, Part III 40. Springer, 2020, pp. 34–63.
- [46] G. Garimella, P. Mohassel, M. Rosulek, S. Sadeghian, and J. Singh, "Private set operations from oblivious switching," in *IACR International Conference on Public-Key Cryptography.* Springer, 2021, pp. 591–617.
- [47] B. Pinkas, T. Schneider, O. Tkachenko, and A. Yanai, "Efficient circuitbased psi with linear communication," in *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Springer, 2019, pp. 122–153.
- [48] P. Rindal and P. Schoppmann, "Vole-psi: fast oprf and circuit-psi from vector-ole," in Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques. Springer, 2021, pp. 901– 930.
- [49] L. Zhou, Z. Wang, H. Cui, Q. Song, and Y. Yu, "Bicoptor: Tworound secure three-party non-linear computation without preprocessing for privacy-preserving machine learning," in 2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). IEEE, 2023, pp. 534–551.
- [50] P. Rindal and S. Raghuraman, "Blazing fast psi from improved okvs and subfield vole." *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, vol. 2022, p. 320, 2022.
- [51] "Tpc-h benchmark," http://www.tpc.org/tpch/.
- [52] S. Krastnikov, F. Kerschbaum, and D. Stebila, "Efficient oblivious database joins," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 13, pp. 2132 – 2145, 2020.
- [53] O. Goldreich, S. Micali, and A. Wigderson, "How to play any mental game or A completeness theorem for protocols with honest majority," in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium* on Theory of Computing, 1987, New York, New York, USA, A. V. Aho, Ed. ACM, 1987, pp. 218–229. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/28395.28420
- [54] A. C. Yao, "How to generate and exchange secrets (extended abstract)," in 27th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Toronto, Canada, 27-29 October 1986. IEEE Computer Society, 1986, pp. 162–167. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1986.25
- [55] C. Gentry, S. Halevi, S. Lu, R. Ostrovsky, M. Raykova, and D. Wichs, "Garbled RAM revisited," in Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT

2014 - 33rd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Copenhagen, Denmark, May 11-15, 2014. Proceedings, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, P. Q. Nguyen and E. Oswald, Eds., vol. 8441. Springer, 2014, pp. 405–422.

- [56] A. Bienstock, S. Patel, J. Y. Seo, and K. Yeo, "Near-optimal oblivious key-value stores for efficient psi, psu and volume-hiding multi-maps," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023.
- [57] Y. Jia, S. Sun, H. Zhou, J. Du, and D. Gu, "Shuffle-based private set union: Faster and more secure," in 31st USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2022, Boston, MA, USA, August 10-12, 2022, K. R. B. Butler and K. Thomas, Eds. USENIX Association, 2022, pp. 2947–2964. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity/2/presentation/iia
- https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/jia
  [58] C. Zhang, Y. Chen, W. Liu, M. Zhang, and D. Lin, "Linear private set union from multi-query reverse private membership test," in 32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023, J. A. Calandrino and C. Troncoso, Eds. USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 337–354. [Online]. Available: https: //www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/zhang-cong
- [59] S. Laur, R. Talviste, and J. Willemson, "From oblivious aes to efficient and secure database join in the multiparty setting," in *International Conference on Applied Cryptography and Network Security*. Springer, 2013, pp. 84–101.
- [60] P. Mohassel, P. Rindal, and M. Rosulek, "Fast databases joins and psi for secret shared data," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2020, pp. 1271–1287.
- [61] Y. Li, D. Ghosh, P. Gupta, S. Mehrotra, N. Panwar, and S. Sharma, "Prism: Private verifiable set computation over multi-owner outsourced databases," in *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*, 2021, pp. 1116–1128.
- [62] W. Zheng, A. Dave, J. G. Beekman, R. A. Popa, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica, "Opaque: An oblivious and encrypted distributed analytics platform," in 14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, NSDI 2017, Boston, MA, USA, March 27-29, 2017, A. Akella and J. Howell, Eds. USENIX Association, 2017, pp. 283– 298.
- [63] A. Bittau, Ú. Erlingsson, P. Maniatis, I. Mironov, A. Raghunathan, D. Lie, M. Rudominer, U. Kode, J. Tinnés, and B. Seefeld, "Prochlo: Strong privacy for analytics in the crowd," in *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, Shanghai, China, October* 28-31, 2017. ACM, 2017, pp. 441–459.
- [64] X. Li, F. Li, and M. Gao, "FLARE: A fast, secure, and memory-efficient distributed analytics framework (flavor: Systems)," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1439–1452, 2023.
- [65] J. V. Bulck, M. Minkin, O. Weisse, D. Genkin, B. Kasikci, F. Piessens, M. Silberstein, T. F. Wenisch, Y. Yarom, and R. Strackx, "Foreshadow: Extracting the keys to the intel SGX kingdom with transient out-of-order execution," in 27th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2018, Baltimore, MD, USA, August 15-17, 2018, W. Enck and A. P. Felt, Eds. USENIX Association, 2018, pp. 991–1008.
- [66] W. Wang, G. Chen, X. Pan, Y. Zhang, X. Wang, V. Bindschaedler, H. Tang, and C. A. Gunter, "Leaky cauldron on the dark land: Understanding memory side-channel hazards in SGX," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2017, Dallas, TX, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017*, B. Thuraisingham, D. Evans, T. Malkin, and D. Xu, Eds. ACM, 2017, pp. 2421–2434.

# Appendix

## A. Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* For  $P_{psiV}$ , a secure PSI protocol [43] only reveals the set intersection and nothing else due to its security guarantee, which means only *E* is revealed to both  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . Thus,  $P_{psiV}$  satisfies level-0 security.

For  $P_{pidV}$ , the functionality of PID [29] outputs  $(\mathcal{M}, RI^*)$ to both parties as described in §III-D. Since  $|RI^*| = |X \cup Y|$ , the  $P_{pidV}$  naturally reveals the union size of X and Y. The identifiers in  $RI^*$  are generated randomly and  $\mathcal{M}$  only tells the mapping relation between the self-owned input and the corresponding identifier in  $RI^*$ , and nothing else is leaked due to the security guarantee of PID. Thus,  $P_{pidV}$  satisfies level-1 security.

For  $P_{secV}$ , the simulators for  $\mathcal{P}_0$  (or  $\mathcal{P}_1$ ) can be naturally constructed by invoking the simulators of the invoked functionalities and sampling random bits with the same length of the outputs of the invoked functionalities. Thus, we can easily prove  $P_{secV}$  securely implement  $P_{map}$  in the ( $P_{cpsi}$ ,  $P_{son}^s$ ,  $P_{shuffle}$ ,  $P_{perGen}$ ,  $P_{perm}^s$ ,  $P_{invp}^s$ ,  $P_{mux}$ )-hybrid model. Thus,  $P_{secV}$ satisfies level-2 security.

# B. View Supporting for PF-FK Join

Now, we describe our view design for the PK-FK join. The definition of the PK-FK view is slightly different from the PK-PK view, and the generation and refresh require additional steps.

W.L.O.G, we assume  $\mathcal{P}_1$ 's join key is a foreign key, which means the values of  $\mathbb{R}^1[k]$  are non-unique, and we can divide them into groups based on distinct FK values. Our high-level idea is to first align a single tuple within a FK group with the corresponding tuple having the same PK key. Then, the payloads of PK tuples are obliviously duplicated to the correct locations to align the remaining tuples, completing the PK-FK join. The single-tuple alignment process is independent of the payload, which means it is reusable when the payload is updated, so the view refreshing is partially free. We illustrate the definition and operations of the PK-FK join view as follows.

1) View for PK-FK join: Given tables  $\mathbb{R}^0$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^1$  with join key k, the views held by  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are  $\mathcal{V}_0 = (\pi_0, \langle E \rangle_0^b, \langle J^0 \rangle_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_1 = (\pi_1, \sigma, \langle E \rangle_1^b, \langle J^0 \rangle_1, J^1)$ , respectively, which satisfy:

- 1)  $\mathbf{J}^1 = \sigma \cdot \pi_1 \cdot \mathbf{R}^1$ , and  $e_i = 1$  iff  $\mathbf{J}_i^1[k] \in \mathbf{R}^0[k]$ .
- 2) For  $1 \le i < |\mathsf{J}^1|, \ \mathsf{J}^1_i[k] \le \mathsf{J}^1_{i+1}[k]$ .
- 3) For  $i \in [|J^1|]$ : if  $e_i = 1$ , let  $p = \text{first}(J^1[k], i)$ , then  $J^0_p = R^0_{\sigma \cdot \pi_0(p)}$  and  $J^0_i = J^0_p$ ; if  $e_i = 0$ ,  $J^0_i = R^0_{\sigma \cdot \pi_0(i)}$ .

2) Generation and refresh: The view is constructed in the following steps, while the refresh operation only requires the last two steps, so it is partially free. It is worth noting that the cost of refresh is relevantly small since it only requires oblivious switching and oblivious traversal taking O(1) rounds and  $O(nl \log n)$  bits of communication.

**1. Mapping and alignment.** First, we align a single tuple within a FK group with the corresponding tuple having the same PK key. To achieve this, a constant 1 is appended to the

PK value by  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and a counter number  $\mathbf{t}[s]$  (*e.g.*, 1,2,3...) is appended to the FK value by  $\mathcal{P}_1$  for each tuple  $\mathbf{t}$ , such that  $\mathbf{t}[s]$ denotes an incremental counter of tuples with the same join key value  $\mathbf{t}[k]$  (within the same FK group). Then, the parties invoke PK-PK view generation protocols (described in §IV-C) with inputs  $\{\mathbf{t}[k]||1\}_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbb{R}^0}$  and  $\{\mathbf{t}[k]||\mathbf{t}[s]\}_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbb{R}^1}$ , respectively.  $\mathcal{P}_0$ obtain  $\pi_0$ ,  $\langle E \rangle_0^b$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  obtain  $\pi_1$ ,  $\langle E \rangle_1^b$ .

Next, we need to ensure the sizes of  $\pi_0, \pi_1, \langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$  are not smaller than  $|\mathsf{R}^1|$  to allow the correct join of each FK tuple subsequently. In this case, if  $n_e = |\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}| < |\mathsf{R}^1|$ , two parties locally extend  $\pi_0, \pi_1$  and  $\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}$  to size  $|\mathsf{R}^1|$ . Specifically, additionally 0s are appended to the end of  $\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \pi_1$  is extended to a size- $|\mathsf{R}^1|$  permutation<sup>2</sup>, and  $\pi_0$  is extended to a size  $|\mathsf{R}^1|$  injective function  $[|\mathsf{R}^1|] \to [max(|\mathsf{R}^0|, |\mathsf{R}^1|)]$  with first  $n_e$ elements unchanged<sup>3</sup>.

Finally, two parties reorder the databases with  $\pi_0, \pi_1$  to obtain a temporary transcript  $D^i = \pi_i \cdot R^i$ . The tuple  $\mathbf{t}^1 \in D^1$  with  $\mathbf{t}^1[s] = 1$  will be aligned with a tuple  $\mathbf{t}^0 \in D^0$  with  $\mathbf{t}^0[k] = \mathbf{t}^1[k]$  if  $\mathbf{t}^1[k] \in D^0[k]$ ; or a tuple  $\mathbf{t}^0 \in D^0$  with  $\mathbf{t}^0[k] \notin D^1[k]$  otherwise. At this point, the first tuple of each FK group of  $D^1$  is correctly joined with the corresponding PK tuple of  $D^0$ .

**2. Local sorting and oblivious switch.**  $\mathcal{P}_1$  sorts the table  $D^1$  based on the key attributes k, s to get the permutation  $\sigma$  and result table  $J^1$ . The parties invoke  $P^p_{osn}$  to switch  $D^0, \langle E \rangle^b$  with  $\sigma$  and obtain  $\langle J^0 \rangle, \langle E' \rangle^b$ . After this step, the tuples of  $J^1$  with the same key will be mapped together and sorted by s.

**3.** Duplicate the tuples. To achieve PK-FK alignment, the last step is to obliviously set the payload of remaining tuples of  $\langle J^0 \rangle$  as correct values. The parties obliviously duplicate the tuples of  $\langle J^0 \rangle$ , such that  $J_i^0 = J_{\text{first}(J^1[k],i)}^0$  holds if  $e'_i = 1$ , where first $(\cdot, i)$  returns the first index of the group *i*.

- 1) For  $i \in |\mathsf{J}^0|$ ,  $\langle \mathsf{J}_i^0 \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{\max}(\langle e_i' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{J}_i^0 \rangle, \langle \bot \rangle)$ ;
- 2)  $\langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}} \leftarrow \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{tray}}(\langle \mathsf{J}^1[k] \rangle, \langle E' \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}, \mathsf{xor});$
- 3)  $\langle \mathbf{J}^0 \rangle \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_{\mathtt{trav}}(\langle \mathbf{J}^1[k] \rangle, \langle \mathbf{J}^0 \rangle, \mathsf{sum}).$

 $\mathcal{P}_0$  set  $\mathcal{V}_0 = (\pi_0, \langle E' \rangle_0^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{J}^0 \rangle_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  set  $\mathcal{V}_1 = (\pi_1, \langle E' \rangle_1^{\mathsf{b}}, \langle \mathsf{J}^0 \rangle_1, \mathsf{J}^1)$ . This is the desired PK-FK join view output, since for every valid tuple  $\mathsf{J}_i^1$  that satisfies  $e_i = 1$ , the payload of tuple  $\mathsf{J}_i^0$  is correctly joined and aligned with it.

# C. Plain Permutation Protocol Pperm

We describe the protocol  $P_{perm}^{p}$  that applies a shared permutation  $\langle \pi \rangle$  on a plain vector X to obtain  $\langle Y \rangle = \langle \pi \cdot X \rangle$  in Fig. 16. By correctness of  $P_{osn}^{s}$  in step-1 and  $P_{osn}^{p}$  in step-3, it holds that  $\rho(i) = \pi(\sigma(i))$  and  $X'_{i} = Y_{\sigma(i)}$ . Also, step-2 gives  $X'_{i} = X_{\rho(i)}$ . Thus, we have  $Y_{\sigma(i)} = X'_{i} = X_{\rho(i)} = X_{\pi(\sigma(i))}$ . This gives  $Y_{i} = X_{\pi(i)}$  as required. Security directly follows from the security of  $P_{osn}^{s}$  and  $P_{osn}^{p}$ . Compared with  $P_{perm}^{s}$  that invokes OSN 4 times,  $P_{perm}^{p}$  only calls OSN 2 times and costs nearly half the communication of  $P_{perm}^{s}$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>To extend a size-x injective function  $\pi := [x] \rightarrow [y]$  to a size-y permutation where y > x, we can append y - x elements in  $[y] - {\pi(i)}_{i \in [x]}$  to the end of  $\pi$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>To extend a size-*x* injective function  $\pi := [x] \to [y]$  to a size-*z* injective function  $\pi' := [z] \to [y]$  where y > z > x, we can randomly select z - x elements from  $[y] - \{\pi(i)\}_{i \in [x]}$  and append them to the end of  $\pi$ .

k	х	k	У	s			k	Х	k	y s	5			k	у	/ S			k	х			k	х
k	2 x2	k4	y1	1		1	k4	x4	k4	y1	1		1	k	4	y1 1		1	k4	x4		1	k4	x4
   k4	x4	k7	y2	1		0	   k6	x6	k5	y5	2		5	k	4	y4 2		0	k1	x1		1	k4	x4
k	5 x6	k5	y3	1	(1)	0	k2	x2	k7	y2	1	(2)	6	k	5	y3 1	Fosn	1	k5	x5	(3)	1	k5	x5
k:	x1	k4	y4	2	$\rightarrow$	0	k3	x3	k5	y6	3	$\rightarrow$	2	k	5	y5 2	$ \top $	0	k6	x6	$\rightarrow$	1	k5	x5
k!	5 x5	k5	y5	2		0	   k1	x1	k4	y4	2		4	k	5 '	y6 3		0	k3	x3		1	k5	x5
k	3 x3	k5	v6	3		1	   k5	x5	k5	y3	1		3	k	7 ,	v2 1		0	k2	x2		0	Ŧ	т
L _	R <sup>₀</sup>	· · · · ·	۲ <sup>1</sup>	ė	(	E)	Ē	<b>D</b> 0		D <sup>1</sup>			σ	1	J	1		Ε'	) ( J	٥)		(E)	( J	0)

Fig. 15: Example of the view generation for the Pk-FK join, where the result permutations in the first step are  $\pi_0$  = (2,3,1,6,4,5) and  $\pi_1 = (1,5,2,6,4,3)$ . We use x, y to denote the other attributes besides k in  $\mathbb{R}^0$  and  $\mathbb{R}^1$ .

**Input:** A length-*n* shared permutation  $\langle \pi \rangle$  and a length-*n* plain vector X owned by S. **Protocol:** 

- 1) The parties invokes  $P^s_{osn}$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  acts as receiver with a random length-*n* permutation  $\sigma$ .  $\langle \rho \rangle \leftarrow \mathsf{P}^{\mathsf{s}}_{\mathsf{osn}}(\sigma, \langle \pi \rangle)$ .
- The parties reveal  $\langle \rho \rangle$  to S, and S computes  $X' = \rho \cdot X$ .
- The parties invokes  $P_{osn}^{p}$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  acts as receiver with  $\sigma^{-1}$ . 3)  $\langle Y \rangle \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{\mathsf{p}}_{\mathsf{osn}}(\sigma^{-1}, X').$

**Output:** The shared relation  $\langle Y \rangle = \langle \pi \cdot X \rangle$ .

Fig. 16: Protocol P<sup>p</sup><sub>perm</sub> to applying a shared permutation on a plain vector.

# D. Bitmap-assisted Sorting-based GA Protocol P<sub>bSorting</sub>

We present the protocol P<sub>bSorting</sub> in Fig. 17. The main difference compared to PoSorting is replacing PsSort with  $P_{\tt bitSort}$  to obtain better efficiency. The first two steps aim to generate bitmap encoding for tuples in the join result, such that  $J_i^0[b^j] = 1$  iff  $J_i^0$  belongs to the join result and the group value of  $J_i^0$  equals  $\mathbb{D}_i^{g_0}$ . Thus, the result permutation in step 4 will sort all tuples in the lexicographic order of attributes  $e, g_0, g_1$ . The following steps 5-7 permute relations based on  $\sigma_b$  and  $\sigma_{q_0}$ , similar to  $P_{oSorting}$ . Thus, oblivious grouping based on  $g_0, g_1$ is achieved. The protocol  $P^{p}_{invp}(\langle \pi \rangle, X)$  will be described in appendix E.

Input: Same as Fig. 6. Protocol: After step 2 of Fig. 6:

- 1)  $\mathcal{P}_0$  generates bitmap encoding of  $g_0: \{J^0[b^1], \ldots, J^0[b^{d_0}]\}$ . 2) Compute for  $j \in [d_0], i \in [n]: \langle J_i^0[b^j] \rangle^b = \langle e_i \rangle^b \odot \langle J_i^0[b^j] \rangle^b$ . 3) Invoke  $\mathbb{P}_{osn}^s$  and append results into  $\mathbb{T}^{(0)}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as receiver with input  $\sigma_b. (\langle \mathbb{T}^{(0)}[b^1] \rangle^b, \ldots, \langle \mathbb{T}^{(0)}[b^d_1] \rangle^b) \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{osn}^s(\sigma_b, (\langle \mathbb{J}^0[b^1] \rangle^b, \ldots, \langle \mathbb{J}^0[b^{d_0}] \rangle^b)).$ 4)  $\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{bitSort}(\langle \mathbb{T}_i^{(0)}[b^1] \rangle^b, \ldots, \langle \mathbb{T}_i^{(0)}[b^{d_0}] \rangle^b).$ 5) The parties invoke  $\mathbb{P}_{invp}^p$  where  $\mathcal{P}_1$  acts as sender, and append results into  $\mathbb{T}^{(2)}: (\langle \mathbb{T}^{(2)}[g_1] \rangle, \langle \mathbb{T}^{(2)}[v_1] \rangle, \langle \rho \rangle) \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_{invp}^p$ .
- $P_{invp}^{p}(\langle \pi_{g_0} \rangle, T^{(1)}[g_1], T^{(1)}[v_1], \sigma_b).$
- 6) The parties invoke  $P_{perm}^{p}$  and append results into  $T^{(2)}$ where  $\mathcal{P}_0$  acts as sender:  $(\langle T^{(2)}[g_0] \rangle, \langle T^{(2)}[v_0] \rangle)$  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathsf{p}}_{\mathtt{perm}}(\langle \rho \rangle, (\mathbf{J}^{\mathsf{0}}[g_0], \mathbf{J}^{\mathsf{0}}[v_0])).$
- 7)  $\langle \mathbf{T}^{(2)}[e] \rangle \leftarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathsf{s}}_{\texttt{perm}}(\langle \rho \rangle, \langle E \rangle^{\mathsf{b}}).$
- Then: Run the remainder after step 5 in Fig. 6.

Fig. 17: Bitmap-assisted sorting-based GA protocol PbSorting. E. Inverse Permutation Protocol P<sup>p</sup><sub>invp</sub>

We describe the protocol that applies an inverse permutation of  $\pi$  on a plain vector X to obtain  $\langle Y \rangle = \langle \pi^{-1} \cdot X \rangle$ . The protocol steps are similar to Ppperm (Fig. 16) with the same complexity. The  $P_{invp}^{p}$  is described as follows. The parties first compute  $\langle \rho \rangle \leftarrow P_{osn}^{s}(\sigma, \langle \pi \rangle)$  where S acts as receiver with a random permutation  $\sigma$ . Then, the parties reveal  $\langle \rho \rangle$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ .  $\mathcal{S}$ compute  $X' = \sigma \cdot X$ . Finally, the parties compute  $\langle Y \rangle \leftarrow$  $P^{s}_{osn}(\rho^{-1},X')$  where  $\mathcal R$  acts as receiver. Correctness follows from the associative law of permutation (similar to  $P_{perm}^{p}$ ) and security directly from the security of sub-protocols.