

# Response to Review on Paper

## *Private Variable-Length Coding with Non-zero Leakage*

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:

- *This paper investigates variable-length encoding under the scenario that there is leakage between the encoded message and some private data, e.g., the mutual information between the encoded message and the private data is non-zero. This is an extension of a prior work that looks at the case when there is no leakage. The paper establishes theoretical upper and lower bounds on the average encoded message length.*

As you have mentioned correctly in this work we have extended the previous work by considering non-zero leakage and upper and lower bounds on the average length of the codeword have been obtained.

- *While the paper is mainly theoretical, and the results are useful, it could benefit from providing more practical examples where such a technique could be useful.*

Thank you for considering our results useful and thanks you for your suggestion. This paper is an initial work on the private compression designs with non-zero leakage, offering potential applicability in a wide range of practical scenarios. For instance, consider a real-world scenario involving a cache-aided network with multiple users, wherein a server aims to transmit a message with the shortest possible average length. In this context, it becomes crucial to address the presence of an adversary eavesdropping on the communication channel, necessitating the utilization of private compression designs as expounded in this paper. As we have shown in this paper one benefit of considering non-zero leakage is to being able to communicate a message even with short shared key size, however, when the leakage is zero this can not be possible. If we can find more space in this paper we will include such examples.

## Response to the Reviewer 3:

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

### Response to the comments:

- *The authors generalize the perfect privacy (secrecy) assumption and consider a non-zero leakage between the private data  $X$  and encoded message  $C$ . They find upper and lower bounds on the average length of the encoded message using different privacy metrics and study them in special cases. In summary, the research topic of this paper is intriguing and holds potential for significant impact within the field of multimedia security.*

As you have outlined correctly in this work we have generalized the previous work by allowing non-zero leakage and upper and lower bounds on the average length of the encoded message have been obtained. Thanks for finding our research topic intriguing and we agree with you about having impact within the field of multimedia security.

## Response to the Reviewer 4:

Thank you for reviewing our paper.

## Response to the comments:

- *The paper presents a protocol for compression of data correlated with other private data when we admit non-zero leakage.*

Thanks for summarizing our paper.

- *While the proposed solution looks to be correct (I didn't check all the details), presentation is really poor. Authors focus on what they do, without explaining why it is important, what are the contributions of the paper, what are the obtained results.*

We apologize about the poor presentation, however, we have emphasized that our main contribution is to extend the previous works by considering non-zero leakage. Moreover, As we have outlined in this paper, one benefit of considering non-zero leakage is to being able to communicate a message even with short shared key size, however, when the leakage is zero this can not be possible. We will improve the presentation by adding more explanations about the results and importance of them if the paper is considered to be accepted.

- *The paper looks like a sequence of formulas, theorem and lemmas, without a high-level description of what they are proposing, making it really difficult to follow.*

If the paper is considered to be accepted, in the final version, we will add more high-level descriptions to clarify the paper and make the results easier to follow.

- *Neither conclusions o future works are provided.*  
We will add conclusion to the final version.

- *Minor typos: ESFRL in section III is EFRL in Lemma 1*  
Will be corrected.