

# Response to Review on Paper

## *Private Variable-Length Coding with Sequential Encoder*

by Amirreza Zamani, Tobias J. Oechtering, Mikael Skoglund

We would like to express our sincere gratitude towards the reviewers for the thorough review and the helpful comments. Below, we respond all comments from the reviewers. The original comments are included in *italic* font. The answers are typed in normal font.

## Response to the Reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for thoroughly reading our paper and for your useful comments.

### Response to the comments:

- *The paper seems to me contributory. Hence the paper can be accepted.*

Thanks for finding our paper contributory and accepting the paper.

- *However the paper may also show some applications of the idea proposed, and experiments if any ...*

We have propose one application in this paper considering a cache-aided network, where the server has buffer so that it should send the codewords sequentially. Other applications can be minimizing the disclosed information where GDPR's data minimization calls for. Moreover, we can suggest physical layer security with low complexity settings such as IoT sensors with energy limited batteries. We can also suggest multimedia security.

- *The only issue the reviewer found was that some of the multi-line formulas have one formula number/index per line, e.g. (22)-(23), (24)-(25), (31)-(32), (37)-(38) and (39)-(40) which seems to be a bit strange.*

Thanks for pointing it out and we will correct it.

## Response to the Reviewer 3:

Thank you very much for reviewing our paper and for your useful comments.

### Response to the comments:

- *The authors present an approach to transmit a private message over a public channel where the server has a database of messages and the client sends a request to get one of those, which is then encoded using an encoder and a private, shared secret (key), known to both, the server and the user. The goal of the proposed approach is to find a response to a users request with minimum average length that (a) satisfies the users demands and (b) guarantees a certain privacy requirement, here the perfect privacy constraint according to Shannons definition. Hence, it forms a variable length coding problem with a perfect privacy constraint that is solved by a multi-part code construction based on an extension of a previously proposed Functional Representation Lemma, combined with a sequential encoder, based on a one-time pad encoding and decoding which also requires the previously encoded messages during encoding/decoding and a variable-length lossless compression technique.*

Thanks for summarizing well our work. As you mentioned correctly we have proposed an achievable scheme and converse bounds where a server sequentially encode a message with minimum possible average length in the presence of an adversary.

- *The paper is technically sound, even though the reviewer is not confident enough to validate all the formulas, theorems and proofs. The paper is also well written in general.*

Thank you for pointing out technical soundness of our paper and finding our paper well written.

- *An obvious problem with the presented approach is that the server and the user need to store the previous messages to be able to encode/decode the current one. So on the one hand, this requires the storage space, in the presented use case a public cache, on the other hand the obvious question is what happens if a transmitted message gets lost or corrupted? Does the system still work? Can it even be detected?*

Thanks for pointing this out. You are correct and we assume that the user have access to the previous responses (codewords). Moreover the server has access to its previous encoded messages. We will point this out in the final version, as mentioned we assumed that the server has access to another memory (public memory). If a message is corrupted then the user can decode the current response since it needs to know the previous responses. Thanks for your suggestion. This can be a new problem and be studied in future.

## Response to the Reviewer 4:

Thank you for reviewing our paper.

### Response to the comments:

- *The proposed manuscript deals with completely different research topics usually tackled by this reviewer. Despite this happens quite commonly during revision processes, one would expect that a manuscript could be followed at least in its introduction, the tackled goal and general considerations by any research scientist working in forensics and security topics. In specific, the proposed paper deals with information theory topics, investigating a variable-length coding scheme that uses privacy-aware compression techniques. I really tried reading the document carefully, but it is out of my possibilities to follow the proposed ideas. The document strongly lacks clarity in all the sections, reporting a sequence of mathematical derivations without proper motivations and definitions.*

We disagree with the reviewer about the introduction. The first two paragraphs provide a clear high-level perspective on the problem setting. We then continue with the related works and in the last paragraph we argue that how our approach is different from other existing problems. We agree that our work has many mathematical results since we are dealing with an information theoretic privacy problem, but we do not agree with lacking clarity of all the sections. We try to improve the final version by adding more explanations about the results and their motivations. Moreover, we will add more statements and explanations to make the paper more clear.

- *Here, a list with some more comments:*
  - *Many mathematical terms are taken for granted and not defined.*
  - *The document does not contain a specific introduction, but it enters in an infinite list of mathematical formulations already in the first rows.*
  - *It is not clear what is the new proposal of the authors and what has been already proposed in the state-of-the-art.*
  - *In Page 5, starting from this sentence: "The variable-length code.." until (24), the equations and the text are exactly the same of Page 2, from (1) to (4). It only changes a parameter but the text and mathematical derivations are the same. It is basically a half-column copy-pasted.*

-We will define the mathematical terms in the final version.

-Usually in the field of information theoretic security and privacy we introduce a high level description of the problem in the first paragraphs of the introduction. We then explain about the related works and highlighting the differences between our work and them, while also elucidating the motivation behind our approach. But, we try to add more explanation to clarify the introduction.

-We have attempted to elucidate the distinctions within the introduction but will make them more clear in the final version. One difference is here we have a sequential encoder with a buffer, while in the previous works there were no buffers.

-The equations are not the same. Please check that in page 5 the problem formulation includes the local caches  $Z_k$  and we have  $N$  users, however in the first problem we only have one user and there is no cache.