

# Physical Zero-Knowledge Proofs for Akari, Takuzu, Kakuro and KenKen\*

Xavier Bultel<sup>1</sup>, Jannik Dreier<sup>2</sup>, Jean-Guillaume Dumas<sup>3</sup>, and Pascal Lafourcade<sup>4</sup>

- 1 LIMOS, University Clermont Auvergne, Campus des Cézeaux, Aubière, France  
xavier.bultel@udamail.fr
- 2 Université de Lorraine, Loria, UMR 7503, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France; and Inria, Villers-lès-Nancy, France; and CNRS, Loria, UMR 7503, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France  
jannik.dreier@loria.fr
- 3 LJK, Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS umr 5224, 51, av. des Mathématiques, BP53, 38041 Grenoble, France. Jean-Guillaume.Dumas@imag.fr
- 4 LIMOS, University Clermont Auvergne, Campus des Cézeaux, Aubière, France  
pascal.lafourcade@udamail.fr

---

## Abstract

Akari, Takuzu, Kakuro and KenKen are logic games similar to Sudoku. In Akari, a labyrinth on a grid has to be lit by placing lanterns, respecting various constraints. In Takuzu a grid has to be filled with 0's and 1's, while respecting certain constraints. In Kakuro a grid has to be filled with numbers such that the sums per row and column match given values; similarly in KenKen a grid has to be filled with numbers such that in given areas the product, sum, difference or quotient equals a given value. We give physical algorithms to realize zero-knowledge proofs for these games which allow a player to show that he knows a solution without revealing it. These interactive proofs can be realized with simple office material as they only rely on cards and envelopes. Moreover, we formalize our algorithms and prove their security.

**1998 ACM Subject Classification** D.4.6 Security and Protection

**Keywords and phrases** Physical Cryptography, ZKP, Games, Akari, Kakuro, KenKen, Takuzu

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs.FUN.2016.8

## 1 Introduction

Akira and Totoro, close friends and both great fans of logical games, decide to challenge each other on their favorite games. Akira is an expert in Akari, and Totoro is a specialist of Takuzu. Each one proposes a grid of his favorite game to the other one as a challenge. However, as both are extremely competitive, they choose grids that are so difficult that the other is not able to solve them, as they are less experienced in the other game. Totoro, working in security, immediately supposes that something went wrong, and wants a proof from Akira that his grid actually has a solution. Akira, feeling hurt by this distrust, directly asks Totoro the same question. Obviously both of them do not want to reveal the solution, as this would render the challenge pointless. So they decide to ask Ken, a common friend,

---

\* This work was partially supported by “Digital trust” Chair from the University of Auvergne Foundation, by the HPAC project of the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR 11 BS02 013), and by the CNRS PEPS JCJC VESPA. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.



for help. However, Ken, a grand master of KenKen, has the same problem. He and his best friend Kakarotto exchanged challenges for KenKen and Kakuro, and want to show each other that they know the solution without revealing it. But then Kakarotto has the idea to ask Cobra, a computer scientist and cryptographer and common friend, for help. Cobra directly sees a solution: a zero knowledge proof of knowledge of the solution (ZKP). A ZKP is a protocol that allows a prover  $P$  to convince a verifier  $V$  that he knows some solution  $s$  to the instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of a problem  $\mathcal{P}$ , without revealing any information about  $s$ . Such a protocol satisfies three properties<sup>1</sup>:

**Completeness:** If  $P$  knows  $s$ , then he is able to convince  $V$ .

**Soundness:** If  $P$  does not know  $s$ , then he is not able to convince  $V$  except with some “small” probability<sup>2</sup>.

**Zero-knowledge:**  $V$  learns *nothing* about  $s$  except  $\mathcal{I}$ , *i.e.* there exists a probabilistic polynomial time algorithm  $\text{Sim}(\mathcal{I})$  (called the simulator) such that outputs of the real protocol and outputs of  $\text{Sim}(\mathcal{I})$  follow the same probability distribution.

Yet, ZKPs are usually executed by computers, which Totoro (a very skeptical security expert) does not trust. However, Cobra is still able to help them, by inventing a ZPK that relies only on physical objects such as cards and envelopes. In this paper, we present Cobra’s solution to Akira’s, Totoro’s, Ken’s and Kakarotto’s dilemma.

**Contributions:** We construct physical ZKP for Akari, Kakuro, KenKen and Takuzu.

- For Akari, our ZKP construction uses special cards and envelopes. Moreover, the prover needs to interact with the verifier to construct the proof.
- For Takuzu, we propose an interactive construction using cards, paper and envelopes.
- For Kakuro, we use red and black cards and envelopes to implement an addition operation.
- For KenKen, we also rely on red and black cards and envelopes, but the interactive proof is more complex due to the different operations (sum, difference, product, quotient).

We also prove the security of our constructions.

**Related Work:** Sudoku, introduced under this name in 1986 by the Japanese puzzle company Nikoli, and similar games such as Akari, Takuzu, Kakuro and Ken-Ken have gained immense popularity in recent years. Following the success of Sudoku, generalizations such as Mojidoku which uses letters instead of digits, and other similar logic puzzles like Hitori, Masyu, Futoshiki, Hashiwokakero, or Nurikabe were developed. Many of them have been proved to be NP-complete [12, 5].

Interactive ZKPs were introduced by Goldwasser *et al.* [8], and it was then shown that for any NP-complete problem there exists an interactive ZKP protocol [7]. An extension by Ben-Or *et al.* [1] showed that every provable statement can be proved in zero-knowledge. They also showed that physical protocols using envelopes exist, yet their construction is – due to its generality – rather involved and often impractical for real problem instances. Proofs can also be non-interactive in the sense that the prover and verifier do not need to interact during the protocol [3]. For more background on ZKPs see for example [15].

As ZKPs have always been difficult to explain, there are works on how to explain the concepts to non experts, partly using physical protocols as illustrations. For example, in

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, if  $\mathcal{P}$  is NP-complete, then the ZKP should be polynomial. Otherwise it might be easier to find a solution than proving that a solution is a correct solution, making the proof pointless.

<sup>2</sup> More precisely, we want a negligible probability, *i.e.*, the probability should be a function  $f$  of a security parameter  $\mathcal{R}$  (for example the number of repetitions of the protocol) such that  $f$  is negligible, that is for every polynomial  $P$ , there exists  $n_0 > 0$  such that  $\forall x > n_0, f(x) < 1/P(x)$ .

their famous paper [18], Quisquater *et al.* propose “Ali Bababa’s cave” as a tool to explain Zero-Knowledge Proof to kids. In [20], ZKP’s are illustrated using a magician that can count the number of sand grains in a heap of sand. Naor *et al.* used the well-known “Where’s Waldo?” cartoons to explain the concept of ZKP to kids, and also proposed an efficient physical protocol for the problem in [17].

In 2007, the same authors proposed a ZKP for Sudoku using cards [9], which partly inspired Cobra’s solution in our paper. This was later extended for Hanjie [4].

As in [9], we here also assume an abstract *shuffle functionality* which is essentially an indistinguishable shuffle of a set of sealed envelopes or of face down cards. This functionality is necessary to prevent information leakage, and cannot be realized neither by the verifier nor the prover. The verifier cannot perform this action, as otherwise he could be perform a shuffle that is not random, and break zero-knowledge. Moreover, in a physical protocol the prover cannot perform this action either, as he might be able to tamper with the packets at this step, similar to a magician performing a card trick. A possible realization would be to rely on a trusted third party (Cobra for instance), or trying to ensure that the prover cannot mess with the cards.

Moreover, there is work on implementing cryptographic protocols using physical objects, for example in [16], where the authors use cards to perform multi-party computations, or in [6] where a physical secure auction protocol is proposed.

**Outline:** For all games, we first present the rules followed by our ZKP construction and then the security analysis. In Section 2, we present Akari, in Section 3, Takuzu, in Section 4 Kakuro, and in Section 5 KenKen. In Section 6, we conclude the paper.

## 2 Akari

*Akari* is a logic puzzle first published in 2001 by *Nikoli*, a Japanese games and logic puzzles publisher. It is also called *Light up*<sup>3</sup>. The goal of the game is to illuminate all the cells of a rectangular grid by placing some lights. The lights illuminate horizontally and vertically all adjacent white cells. The grid also contains black cells, which represent walls that the light cannot cross. Some black cells can contain an integer between 0 and 4. To illuminate all the cells, lights have to be added in the white cells according to the following constraints:


1. Two lights cannot illuminate each other.
2. The number in a black cell indicates how many lights are present in the adjacent white cells, *i.e.*, in the white cells directly above, below, left and right of the number.
3. All the white cells are illuminated by at least one light.

In Figure 1, we give a simple example of an Akari game. It is easy to verify that the three constraints are satisfied, but solving Akari was shown to be NP-complete *via* a reduction from Circuit-SAT [14].


### 2.1 ZKP Construction for Akari

Our aim is to give a ZKP proof such that Akira, the prover denoted by  $P$ , proves to Totoro, the verifier denoted by  $V$ , that he knows a solution of a given Akari grid  $G$ . We assume that the grid is printed on a sheet of paper, and that we can use a *shuffle functionality*. We use

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Light\\_Up\\_\(puzzle\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Light_Up_(puzzle))



■ **Figure 1** Example of an Akari grid and its solution.



■ **Figure 2** Illustrations for steps 1 to 3 in the Akari ZKP construction. From left to right: **Step 1:** two cards added on all white cells. **Step 2:** cards added around black cells with number. **Step 3:** cards added per cell as a function of adjacent cells.

two kinds of cards to model the fact that there is one light or not in one cell of the solution. The symbol  $\bigcirc$  represents the presence of a light, and an empty card the absence of a light.

**Setup:** According to his solution, the prover  $P$  places, face down on each white cell,  $\bigcirc$  cards when there is a light, and empty cards when there is none. Note that all the cards in the packet on the same cell are thus identical. Placing the cards happens in three phases:

1. In all white cells,  $P$  adds 2 cards face down (first illustration in Figure 2).
2.  $P$  adds an additional card for all white cells adjacent to a black cell that contains a number. For instance, in the second illustration in Figure 2, for the black cell containing the number 4,  $P$  adds one card in all positions with a grey background, and similarly for the black cells containing 0 and 2.
3. Finally, for each white cell in the grid,  $P$  places a card on the cell and all horizontally and vertically adjacent white cells. The third illustration in Figure 2 shows this for the top left cell:  $P$  adds a card to the cell itself, and to the six adjacent cells (all marked in grey, two below and four to the right). This has to be done for all white cells.
4. The same three steps are repeated once more to build a dual second grid, *i.e.*, a grid where all empty cards are replaced by light cards and *vice-versa*.

At the end of the algorithm,  $P$  has added multiple cards face down on each cell of the grid  $G$  and its dual grid  $\hat{G}$ .

**Verification:** To check the correctness of the solution, the verifier picks a random bit  $c$  in  $\{0, 1\}$  and executes the following verifications:

- if  $c = 0$ :** For each cell of the grid  $G$  the verifier places the packet of cards in an envelope, then he does the same for each cell of grid  $\hat{G}$ . He shuffles the envelopes using the shuffle functionality, and then opens each envelope to check whether it contains only light cards or only empty cards. With this he is sure that all the cards on a given cell were identical.
- if  $c = 1$ :** The verifier discards all the cards on the dual grid  $\hat{G}$  and checks whether the 3 constraints that a solution should satisfy are respected using the cards on the grid  $G$ :

1. **No two lights see each other:** For each row or column of adjacent white cells,  $V$  randomly picks one card per cell to form a packet. Then  $V$  passes the cards to the *shuffle functionality* who shuffles them, and passes them on to  $P$ . If all cards are empty cards then  $P$  adds a  $\bigcirc$  card, otherwise he adds an empty card.  $P$  returns the cards, once again shuffled, to  $V$ , who checks that there is exactly one light card in the packet.
2. **Black cells:** For each black cell that contains a number  $l$ ,  $V$  picks one card in all adjacent cells and gives them to the shuffle functionality. He then looks at the cards and checks that the number  $l$  corresponds to the number of  $\bigcirc$  cards. In second illustration of Figure 2, a card from all grey cells has to be collected to verify the black cell containing the number 4.
3. **All cells are illuminated:** For each cell,  $V$  picks one card from the cell plus one card from all horizontally and vertically adjacent white cells (for example, for the top left cell in Figure 2, he takes one card from all grey cells).  $V$  passes all collected cards face down to  $P$ . If there are two light cards in the received cards, then  $P$  adds one empty card, otherwise he adds one  $\bigcirc$  card.  $P$  passes the cards to the shuffle functionality, and returns them to  $V$ . Then  $V$  opens the cards and checks that there is exactly two light cards in the packet.

This protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times where  $\mathfrak{K}$  is a chosen security parameter. Note that the number of cards to place on the grid and the number of verification steps is polynomial in the size of the grid, making our ZKP polynomial both for the prover and the verifier.

## 2.2 Security Proofs for Akari

We now prove the security of our construction.

► **Lemma 1 (Akari Completeness).** *If  $P$  knows a solution of a given Akari grid, then he is able to convince  $V$ .*

**Proof.** If  $P$  knows the solution of an Akari grid, he can place the cards on the grids ( $G$  and  $\hat{G}$ ) following our ZKP algorithm. Then on each cell of both grids there is a packet of identical cards, showing either nothing or a light, depending on whether there is a light in the solution. The verifier picks  $c$  among  $\{0, 1\}$ .

**if  $c = 0$ :** The verifier  $V$  puts each packet on each cell for the two grids into envelopes and shuffles them. Since all the packets on cells on both grids contain the same kind of card, the verifier accepts.

**if  $c = 1$ :** In the following, when taking a card from a cell, the verifier  $V$  randomly picks one card among all the cards in that cell. This has no effect when the prover is honest since all of them are identical. Using these cards, the verifier checks the three properties that a solution should satisfy.

- To check that two lights cannot see each other, for all lines and columns the verifier takes one card from each cell inside the line or column and asks the prover to add one extra card. The resulting selection is then shuffled. As the solution is correct, there can be either no light or one light, but not more, as otherwise two lights would see each other. If there is none,  $P$  adds one, otherwise he adds an empty card. Thus the cards contain exactly one light, which  $V$  will successfully verify.
- For all black cells that contain a number, the verifier picks one card in all adjacent white cells, uses the shuffle functionality on the selected cards, and then verifies that they contain the same number of lights as is written in the black cell. As  $P$ 's solution is correct, the verification will succeed.

- To verify that each cell of the grid is illuminated by a light, for each cell the verifier picks one card from all white cells which are horizontally and vertically adjacent. He asks  $P$  to add exactly one card according to the algorithm and uses the shuffle functionality on the remaining cards. As the solution is correct, there will be either one or two lamps in the packet since each cell is illuminated, so after adding the right card there will be exactly two. Then  $V$  verifies that the set of cards contains exactly two lights, which will succeed. ◀

► **Lemma 2 (Akari Soundness).** *If  $P$  does not know a solution of a given Akari's grid of size  $n$  then he is not able to convince  $V$  except with a negligible probability lower than  $p = (\frac{1}{2})^{\mathfrak{R}}$  when the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{R}$  times.*

**Proof.** We call a *cell-packet* the set of cards that are placed in one cell. When the verifier is collecting some cards during the verification phase for one cell, we also call a *row-packet* the set of cards that are collected in an horizontal line, a *column-packet* the set of cards that are collected in a vertical line and *cross-packet* the set of cards that are collected in horizontally and vertically adjacent white cells of a given cell.

Given a grid of size  $n$ , we show that if  $P$  is able to perform the proof for any challenge  $c$ , then he has a solution of the grid. This implies by contraposition that if the prover does not have a solution, then he fails the procedure for either  $c = 0$ , or  $c = 1$ , or both. In that case the probability that the verifier asks him a challenge for which he does not have a solution is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ , which results in the probability of  $p = (\frac{1}{2})^{\mathfrak{R}}$  as the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{R}$  times.

Thus it suffices to show that if  $P$  is able to perform the proof for  $c = 0$  and  $c = 1$ , then he has a solution of the grid.

If  $P$  is able to perform the proof for  $c = 0$ , then his commitment is well-formed, *i.e.*, all the cards in each cell-packet are the same.

If  $P$  is able to perform the proof for  $c = 1$ , then his solution passes all the verifier's checks. Moreover, we show that if the commitment of the prover is well-formed (which we know from the above), and this commitment does not correspond to a solution, then the verifier detects it with our ZKP algorithm. This implies that the prover has a solution to the grid, which is what we need to show to conclude the proof.

Suppose now that the commitment is well-formed, and that it does not correspond to a solution. Then we can distinguish three cases for the commitment, each corresponding to one constraint of the game that is not respected:

- There are two lights that can see each other. According to our ZKP, the verifier picks a row-packet or a column-packet for each row or column and passes it to the prover. The prover adds one card and gives it back to the verifier. Then the verifier checks that there is exactly one light in the packet. If there are two lights that can see each other, the prover cannot cheat and the verifier will see at least two lights.
- There is not the right number of lights close to a black cell containing a number. Then the verifier discovers that the number of lights does not match when he performs the second point of our ZKP algorithm.
- A cell is not illuminated. According to our algorithm, the verifier picks a cross-packet for this cell. Then he gives the packet to the prover who adds one extra card. Then the verifier checks that there are exactly two lights in the packet. If the cell is not illuminated, he will have at most one light in the packet and thus detect the error.

Thus, if the commitment is well-formed and does not correspond to a solution, the verifier will detect it. Hence, if the prover passes all the verifier's checks, he has a solution, which concludes the proof. ◀

Note that an optimal soundness of 0 can be obtained using a stronger model, namely the *triplicate functionality* of [9, § 4.2]. Instead of the challenge  $c = 0$ , one uses cards that can be cut in  $k$  equal parts (a “*k-plicate functionality*”), thus guaranteeing identical parts.

► **Lemma 3** (Akari Zero-Knowledge). *V learns nothing about P’s solution of a given Akari grid.*

**Proof.** We use the proof technique described in [9, Protocol 3]: to show zero-knowledge, we have to describe an efficient simulator that simulates any interaction between a cheating verifier and a real prover. The simulator does not have a correct solution, but it does have an advantage over the prover: when shuffling decks, it is allowed to swap the packets for different ones. We thus show how to construct a simulator for each challenge  $c$  in  $\{0, 1\}$  in the Akari ZKP.

**if  $c = 0$ :** The simulator simulates the prover  $P$  as follows: it fills the grid  $G$  only with empty cards and the dual grid  $\hat{G}$  only with light cards. If the verifier chooses the challenge  $c = 0$ , the verifier puts each packet of cards in an envelope of both grids and shuffles them. Then he checks that all packets contain only the same card. This perfectly simulates an interaction with the real prover because there are two packets for each cell: one with only light cards and one with only empty cards.

**if  $c = 1$ :** The simulator first prepares the following packets:

- For each white cell in a row of  $r$  white cells and in a column of  $c$  white cells, the simulator sets:
  - A packet containing  $(c)$  empty cards (denoted type 1).
  - A packet containing  $(r)$  empty cards (denoted type 2).
  - A packet containing  $(c + r - 3)$  empty cards and 2  $\bigcirc$  cards (denoted type 3).
- For each black cell with number  $l$ , the simulator sets a packet containing  $l$   $\bigcirc$  cards and  $4 - l$  empty cards. Such a packet is of type 4.

Then, still when the verifier has chosen the challenge  $c = 1$ , the verifier discards the dual grid  $\hat{G}$  and execute the following checks:

- **No two lights see each other:** for each horizontal (resp. vertical) line of adjacent white cells,  $V$  randomly picks one card per cell to form a packet. Then the simulator, acting as the shuffle functionality, replaces this packet by the type 1 (resp. 2) packet corresponding to the same cell. The simulator, now acting as  $P$ , adds one  $\bigcirc$  card to the packet and returns the cards to  $V$ , who can check that there is exactly one light card in the packet.
- **Black cells:** for each black cell that contains a number  $l$ ,  $V$  picks one card in all adjacent cells to form a packet. Then the simulator, acting as the shuffle functionality, replaces this packet by the type 4 packets corresponding to the same cell.  $V$  looks at the cards and can check that  $l$  corresponds to the number of  $\bigcirc$  cards.
- **All cells are illuminated:** for each cell,  $V$  picks one card from the cell plus one card from all horizontally and vertically adjacent white cells. Then the simulator, acting as the shuffle functionality, replaces this packet by the type 3 packet corresponding to the same cell. The simulator, now acting as  $P$ , adds one empty card to the packet and returns the cards to  $V$ , who can check that there are exactly two light cards in the packet.

For each cell, all cards are face down before the last shuffle of all packets and the simulated proofs and the real proofs are indistinguishable. Therefore,  $V$  learns nothing from the verification phases and the protocol is zero-knowledge. ◀

	1		0
		0	
	0		
1	1		0

0	1	1	0
1	0	0	1
0	0	1	1
1	1	0	0

■ **Figure 3** Example of a Takuzu grid and its solution.

### 3 Takuzu

*Takuzu* is a puzzle invented by Frank Coussement and Peter De Schepper in 2009<sup>4</sup>. It was also called *Binero*, *Bineiro*, *Binary Puzzle*, *Brain Snacks* or *Zernero*. A similar game (using crosses and circles) was proposed in 2012 by Aldolfo Zanellat under the name of *Tic-Tac-Logic*. The goal of Takuzu is to fill a rectangular grid of even size with 0's and 1's. An initial Takuzu grid already contains a few filled cases. A grid is solved when it is full (*i.e.*, no empty cases) and respects the following constraints:

1. Each row and each column contains exactly the same number of 1's and 0's.
2. Each row is unique among all rows, and each column is unique among all columns.
3. In each row and each column there can be no more than two same numbers adjacent to each other; for example 110010 is possible, but 110001 is impossible.

Figure 3 contains a simple  $4 \times 4$  Takuzu grid and its solution. We can verify that each row and column is unique, contains the same number of 0's and 1's, and there are never three consecutive 1's or 0's. The problem of solving a Takuzu grid was proven to be NP complete in [2, 23].

#### 3.1 ZKP Construction for Takuzu

Similar to Akari, our aim is to give a ZKP proof such that the prover  $P$ , now Totoro, proves to the verifier  $V$ , now Akira, that he knows a solution of a given Takuzu grid. We assume that the grid is printed on a sheet of paper, and use two kinds of cards: cards with a 0 or a 1 printed on them. Moreover, we also use a second grid, a piece of paper, and an envelope.

**Setup:** Let  $G$  be the  $n \times n$  Takuzu grid and  $S$  its solution known by  $P$ . The prover chooses uniformly at random two permutations:  $\pi_R$  for the rows, and  $\pi_C$  for the columns. He then computes  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$ , and writes the two permutations  $\pi_C$  and  $\pi_R$  on a paper, and inserts it into an envelope  $E$ . Then  $P$  places cards face down on the second grid according to  $S'$ . We denote these cards  $\tilde{S}'$ .

**Verification:** The verifier  $V$  picks  $c$  randomly among  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ .

**If  $c = 0$ :**  $P$  opens the envelope  $E$ . Then  $V$  takes the initial grid  $G$  and computes  $G' = \pi_R(\pi_C(G))$ .  $V$  reveals those cards in  $\tilde{S}'$  that are in places of initial values of the grid in  $G'$ . He checks that the all revealed cards are equal to the initial values given in  $G'$ .

**If  $c = 1$ :** The verifier  $V$  picks  $d$  randomly among  $\{0, 1\}$ . If  $d = 0$  (resp.  $d = 1$ ), for each row (resp. column), the verifier takes all the cards in the row (resp. in the column) without looking at them. Each one of these  $n$  decks is shuffled by the shuffle functionality and

<sup>4</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Takuzu>



then the verifier opens all cards and checks that each deck contains exactly the same number of 1's and 0's.

**If  $c = 2$ :** The verifier checks that a randomly chosen row or column is different from all other rows or columns. For this, the verifier picks randomly one row or one column. The verifier opens all the cards of his chosen row (or column). For each of the  $n - 1$  other rows (or columns) the verifier takes all the cards that are in the same column (or row) as a 0 in the revealed row (or column), without looking at them. Each one of these  $n - 1$  sets of cards is shuffled by the shuffle functionality and given back to the prover, who reveals one card per set that is a 1. Thus each one of the other  $n - 1$  rows (or columns) has a 1 where the revealed row (or column) has a 0, they are thus different from the revealed row. If there are several 1's in a deck, the prover randomly chooses which one to reveal.

**If  $c = 3$ :**  $P$  opens  $E$ . Then  $V$  permutes (face down) the cards of  $\tilde{S}'$  to obtain  $\tilde{S} = \pi_c^{-1}(\pi_R^{-1}(\tilde{S}'))$ . Then,  $V$  picks  $d$  randomly among  $\{0, 1\}$  and  $e$  randomly among  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**If  $d = 0$ :** For each row,  $V$  sets  $x = \lfloor \frac{n-e}{3} \rfloor$  decks of three cards  $\{(e + 3 \cdot i + 1, e + 3 \cdot i + 2, e + 3 \cdot i + 3)\}_{\{0 \leq i < x\}}$  where the triplet  $(i, j, k)$  denotes a deck containing the  $i^{\text{th}}$ , the  $j^{\text{th}}$  and the  $k^{\text{th}}$  cards of the row.

**If  $d = 1$ :** For each column,  $V$  sets  $x = \lfloor \frac{n-e}{3} \rfloor$  decks of three cards  $\{(e + 3 \cdot i + 1, e + 3 \cdot i + 2, e + 3 \cdot i + 3)\}_{\{0 \leq i < x\}}$  where the triplet  $(i, j, k)$  denotes a deck containing the  $i^{\text{th}}$ , the  $j^{\text{th}}$  and the  $k^{\text{th}}$  cards of the column.

Then,  $V$  gives the decks to  $P$  one by one. For each deck, the prover discards one of the two identical cards (*e.g.*, a 1 if he has 101, and a 0 in case of *e.g.*, 001). Then  $P$  reveals the cards to  $V$ , who accepts only if he sees two different cards. Note that it is possible to do this verification step for several sequences of three cards.

To have the best security guarantees, the verifier should choose his challenges  $c, d$ , etc. such that each combination of challenges at the end has the same probability. This protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times where  $\mathfrak{K}$  is a chosen security parameter. Note that the ZKP is again polynomial in the size of the grid, as shown next.

### 3.2 Security Proofs for Takuzu

We now prove the security of our construction.

► **Lemma 4 (Takuzu Completeness).** *If  $P$  knows a solution of a given Takuzu grid, then he is able to convince  $V$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $P$ , knowing the solution  $S$  of the grid  $G$ , runs the setup algorithm as described in Section 3.1. Then we show that  $P$  is able to perform the proof for any challenge  $c \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ .

**If  $c = 0$ :** Since  $S$  is the solution of  $G$ ,  $G' = \pi_R(\pi_C(G))$  and  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$ , the values of the cards in  $\tilde{S}'$  that are in places of non empty cells of  $G'$  are equal to the corresponding values of the grid in  $G'$ .

**If  $c = 1$ :**  $S$  has  $(n/2)$  occurrences of 1 and  $(n/2)$  occurrences of 0 on each row and column. Column and row permutations do not change this property. Therefore, since  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$ ,  $S'$  has  $(n/2)$  occurrences of 1 and  $(n/2)$  occurrences of 0 on each row and column.

**If  $c = 2$ :** If a row (resp. column) of  $S$  is unique and all rows (resp. columns) have the same number of 0's, then no other row of  $S$  can have its 0's at the exact same places. Column and row permutations in  $S'$  do not change this property.

**If  $c = 3$ :** Since  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$ ,  $\tilde{S} = \pi_C^{-1}(\pi_R^{-1}(\tilde{S}'))$  is the solution  $S$  hidden with cards face down, and three consecutive cells of  $S$  are never the same since  $S$  is a valid solution. Then, using three consecutive cards, the prover is always able to discard one out of three cards such that two different cards remain. ◀

► **Lemma 5** (Takuzu Soundness). *If  $P$  does not provide a solution of a given  $n \times n$  Takuzu grid  $G$ , then he is not able to convince  $V$  except with a negligible probability  $\left(1 - \frac{1}{2n+9}\right)^{\mathfrak{K}}$  when the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times.*

**Proof.** We show that if  $P$  is able to perform the proof of a solution of  $G$  for any challenge ( $c$  and the sub-challenges  $d, e$ , etc. depending on  $c$ ), then he knows a solution to the Takuzu grid. During the setup phase,  $P$  commits:

- An envelope  $E$  containing two permutations  $\pi_C$  and  $\pi_R$ .
- A grid of face down cards  $\tilde{S}'$ .

We set  $S = \pi_C^{-1}(\pi_R^{-1}(\tilde{S}'))$ . Since  $P$  is able to perform the proof for any challenge, we observe that:

- Non empty cells of  $G' = \pi_R(\pi_C(G))$  are equal to corresponding cells of  $S'$ . Then **non empty cells of  $G$  are equal to corresponding cells of  $S$** .
- Rows and columns of  $S'$  have the same number of 0s and 1s, and each row and each column of  $S'$  is unique. Then, **rows and columns of  $S$  have the same number of 0s and 1s, and each row and each column of  $S$  is unique**.
- **Three consecutive cells of  $S$  do not contain the same value.**

We deduce that  $S$  is a solution of  $G$ . Hence, if  $P$  does not provide a solution of  $G$ , then he fails the proof for at least one of the challenges. To compute the probability, we enumerate the possible challenges for all values of  $c$ :

**If  $c = 0$ :** In this case there is only one possible challenge.

**If  $c = 1$ :** There are two possibilities, verifying the rows, or verifying the columns.

**If  $c = 2$ :** There are  $2n$  choices for the verifier,  $n$  rows and  $n$  columns.

**If  $c = 3$ :** There are two possible values for the challenge  $d$  and three possible values for the challenge  $e$ , then, there is  $2 \times 3 = 6$  combinations for the pair  $(d, e)$ .


Overall,  $P$  receives a challenge out of  $1 + 2 + 2n + 6 = 2n + 9$  possibilities. We suppose that the verifier selects any one of these challenges uniformly at random. If the prover gives a wrong grid, then at least one of the checks will fail, and this check will have been selected with probability  $\frac{1}{2n+9}$ . As the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times, the probability that  $P$  convinces

$V$  without the solution is at least  $\left(1 - \frac{1}{2n+9}\right)^{\mathfrak{K}}$ . ◀

► **Lemma 6** (Takuzu Zero-Knowledge). *During the verification phase,  $V$  learns nothing about  $P$ 's solution for a given Takuzu grid.*

**Proof.** Similar to the proof for Akari, we show how to construct a simulator for each challenge  $c \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ :

$c = 0$ : The simulator completes the grid  $G$  with random bits to obtain the grid  $S$ , and randomly chooses the two permutations  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$ . It then puts  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  in an envelope  $E$  and it commits  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$  using cards face down (we denote this commitment  $\tilde{S}'$ ). Then it simulates the prover and the verifier as follows: the prover commits  $(E, \tilde{S}')$ . Then the verifier can open  $E$  and use  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  to compute  $G' = \pi_R(\pi_C(G))$ .  $V$  can then return those cards in  $\tilde{S}'$  that are in places of initial values of the grid in  $G'$  and check that all returned cards are equal to the initial values given in  $G'$ . Since  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  are randomly chosen, and since the values of cards in  $\tilde{S}'$  that are in places of non empty



■ **Figure 4** Simple example of a Kakuro grid and its solution.

cells  $G' = \pi_R(\pi_C(G))$  are equal to the corresponding values of the grid in  $G'$  (the other cards of  $\tilde{S}'$  remain face down), the simulated proofs and real proofs are indistinguishable.

$c = 1$ : When the verifier shuffles the decks of cards taken in a single row or column using the shuffle functionality, the simulator returns  $(n/2)$  cards with 1's and  $(n/2)$  cards with 0's, shuffled. This is indistinguishable from a shuffled deck with the same number of 1's and 0's.

$c = 2$ : When the verifier selects a row or column, the simulator randomly chooses to position  $(n/2)$  1's and  $(n/2)$  0's. Given the random permutations  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$ , the permuted chosen row is indistinguishable from a randomly chosen one. Then, when the verifier shuffles the deck corresponding to selected cards in the other rows (or columns), the simulator places one card with a 1, and  $(n/2 - 1)$  randomly selected other cards. Once again this is indistinguishable from the given decks, as the verifier only sees one card with a 1.

$c = 3$ : The simulator chooses randomly  $S$  such that three cells of  $S$  never contain the same bit. It randomly chooses the two permutations  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  and puts  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  in an envelope  $E$ . It commits  $S' = \pi_R(\pi_C(S))$  using cards face down (we denote this commitment  $\tilde{S}'$ ). Then it simulates the interaction between the prover and the verifier as follows: the prover commits  $(E, \tilde{S}')$ . The verifier opens  $E$  and uses  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  to compute  $\tilde{S} = \pi_C^{-1}(\pi_R^{-1}(\tilde{S}'))$ , where  $\tilde{S}$  is the commitment of  $S$  using face down cards. The verifier then randomly chooses  $d$  and  $e$  and collects the cards according to the verification algorithm.  $V$  then gives each deck of three cards to the prover. For each deck, the prover thus obtains three cards such that (exactly) two cards are identical. He discards one of these two cards and returns the two different cards. Since  $\pi_R$  and  $\pi_C$  are randomly chosen, then simulated proofs and real proofs are indistinguishable. ◀

Therefore, our protocol for Takuzu is complete, sound and zero-knowledge.

## 4 Kakuro

*Kakuro* can be seen as a numerical version of crosswords. According to [21], it was proposed for the first time in the 1950's as a logic puzzle in "Official Crossword Puzzles" by Dell Publishing Company. It is also known by its original English name *Cross Sums*.

A Kakuro grid contains square and triangular white cells, and sometimes also black cells. The goal is to fill in the white cells on the grid with digits from 1 to 9, such that the sum of each line and each column corresponds to the total given in each triangular cell. Moreover, in each line and in each column a number can appear only once. An example of the game with its the solution is given in Figure 4. This game has been proven NP-complete in [12, 22].

### 4.1 ZKP Construction for Kakuro

In this game, the main challenge is to be able to verify that a sum of some numbers is correct without revealing any other information.

**Setup:** In this construction, we use black and red playing cards. To represent a number  $l$ , for instance 3, we put 9 cards into an envelope:  $l = 3$  black cards and  $9 - l = 6$  red cards. Using this trick, we can construct a ZKP as follows:

1. In each cell, we place 4 identical envelopes containing some cards that correspond to the number contained in the cell of the solution. The number is encoded using some cards as explained above.
2. Next to each triangular cell, we place envelopes containing cards for all missing numbers in this line or column. For instance, for the first line of Figure 4, we place 7 envelopes containing black and red cards corresponding to the numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

**Verification:** We proceed as follows:

- To verify that a number appears only once per line and per column, the verifier proceeds as follows: For each line and each column, he randomly picks an envelope per cell plus all the envelopes next to the triangular cell. The packet of envelopes is shuffled by the shuffle functionality, and then the verifier opens all the envelopes and verifies that all numbers appear only once, and that all numbers between 1 and 9 are present.
- To verify that the sum per line and per column corresponds to the number in the triangular cell, the verifier randomly picks one envelope per cell in the line (resp. in the column) and opens (face down) the content of each envelope. All the cards are shuffled by the shuffle functionality and then the verifier returns them. He can then check that the number of black cards corresponds to the number given in the triangular cell.

This protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times where  $\mathfrak{K}$  is a chosen security parameter. It is easy to see that the ZKP is polynomial in the size of the grid as we only need a polynomial number of cards and verification steps.

### 4.2 Security Proofs for Kakuro

We prove the security of our ZKP protocol for Kakuro.

► **Lemma 7 (Kakuro Completeness).** *If  $P$  knows a solution of a given Kakuro grid, then he is able to convince  $V$ .*

**Proof.** After a correct setup each cells contains identical envelopes.

- The unicity of numbers per row or column is given by the fact that all  $n$  numbers are present exactly once between the envelopes within the cell and next to the triangle of the row/column.
- The correctness of the sum is given by the fact that when mixed the number of black cards is exactly the value within the triangle. ◀

► **Lemma 8 (Kakuro Soundness).** *If  $P$  does not provide a solution of a given Kakuro grid, then he is not able to convince  $V$  except with a negligible probability lower than  $p = (1/4)^{\mathfrak{K}}$  when the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times.*

**Proof.** The proof follows the same line as in [9, Lemma 1]. Each rule is separately verified (unicity in row/column, correct sum in row/column).

Assume that the prover does not know a valid solution for the puzzle. Then he is always caught by the protocol as a liar if he places the cards such that each cell has four cards of identical value. The only way a prover can cheat is by placing on a cell, say cell  $a$ , four envelopes that do not all contain the same value. This means that in this cell at least one envelope contains a value  $y$  different from at least 2 of the other 3 numbers. Given any assignment of envelopes to the unicities and sums for all other cells, there is either only one envelope with value  $y$  in the cell and thus for the (cheating) prover exactly one of the unicities/sums rules that requires  $y$  in this cell, or there are two envelopes with value  $y$  in the cell and exactly two of the unicities/sums rules require  $y$  in this cell. In the first case, the probability that for cell  $a$  the verifier assigns  $y$  to the one rule needing it is  $1/4$ . When there are two envelopes encoding  $y$  in the cell, the probability to assign  $y$  to the first rule needing it is  $1/2$  and then the probability to assign the second  $y$  to the second rule needing it is  $1/3$ , overall this is  $1/6 < 1/4$ . As the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{R}$  times, the probability that  $P$  convinces  $V$  without the solution is bounded by  $(1/4)^{\mathfrak{R}}$ , which is negligible. ◀

▶ **Lemma 9** (Kakuro Zero-Knowledge).  *$V$  learns nothing about  $P$ 's solution of a given Kakuro grid.*

**Proof.** As in the proof for Akari (Lemma 3) we use the advantage of the simulator over the prover: when shuffling packets (of selected envelopes to show unicity; or collected cards for sums) it is allowed to swap the packets for different ones. The simulator acts as follows:

- The simulator places four arbitrary envelopes on each cell.
- The verifier randomly picks the envelopes for the corresponding packets.
- Then there are two cases:
  - When verifying the unicity of a number, the envelopes in a packet are shuffled. The simulator swaps the packets with a randomly shuffled packet of envelopes, in which each value appears once.
  - When verifying the sums, the envelopes are opened and mixed by the verifier. Then all the cards are shuffled. The simulator swaps the set of cards with a randomly shuffled packet with the same number of cards, in which the number of black cards corresponds to the sum.

The final packets are indistinguishable from those provided by an honest prover assuming that the shuffle functionality guarantees that the packets each contain randomly shuffled sets. ◀

## 5 Ken-Ken

*KenKen* is a Japanese game invented by Tetsuya Miyamoto, also known as *Calculudoku*, *Mathdoku* or *Kendoku*. It combines ideas from Sudoku and Kakuro. A KenKen grid is a square grid of size  $n \times n$ . To solve a KenKen grid, like in Sudoku, each row and each column must contain exactly once all numbers between 1 and  $n$ . Moreover, a KenKen grid is divided in groups of cells called *cages*. The example given in Figure 5 contains 3 cages: one vertical line of 3 cells, one horizontal line of 2 cells and a square of 4 cells. Each cage contains a *target* number that has to be produced using the numbers in the cells (in any order) and the mathematical operation (addition, subtraction, multiplication or division) given before the target number. For example in Figure 5, the vertical three-cell cage with the addition operator and a target number of 6 is satisfied with the digits 1, 2, and 3, as  $3 + 1 + 2 = 6$ . The target number and the operator are given in the upper left corner of a cage. The target must be a positive integer. KenKen is known to be NP-complete [13, 11, 10].

+ 6	- 1	
	* 18	

+ 6	- 1	
3	1	2
1	* 18	3
2	3	1

■ **Figure 5** Simple example of a KenKen grid and one possible solution.

In most KenKen grids, division and subtraction operators are restricted to cages of only two cells. For instance in the grid given in Figure 5, the cage with the subtraction operator and the target of 1 has four possible solutions when analyzed in isolation:  $(1, 2)$ ,  $(2, 1)$ ,  $(2, 3)$  or  $(3, 2)$ . In general grids do not need to respect this hypothesis, and there are puzzles that use more than two cells for these operations. In any case, for each subtraction or division cage, there is at least one maximal element of which the other elements in the cage are subtracted or divided.

### 5.1 ZKP Construction for KenKen

We use the same idea as in Sudoku [9] to verify that all numbers appear only once per row and column. We also use the same representation of numbers as in Kakuro, and the same technique to verify the addition cages. For multiplications, the idea is to check the sum of the exponents of the prime factors of the target. Indeed, in a  $n \times n$  grid, all prime factors are below  $n$  and there are at most  $\mathcal{O}(n/\log(n))$  of those (see, *e.g.*, [19]), so we need at most that number of parallel exponent addition protocols. There we need to encode each integer by its prime factor exponents: for this we use small envelopes marked with the prime factor  $p$ , called  $p$ -envelopes, and containing the black/red cards encodings for the associated exponent. The maximum possible exponents have to be found among the factors of the integers between 1 and  $n$ . For instance, with  $n = 9$ , all the integers are encoded with the primes 2, 3, 5, 7, with respective exponents between 0 and 3, between 0 and 2, and between 0 and 1 for both 5 and 7. Therefore the 2-envelopes contain exactly 3 cards, the 3-envelopes 2 cards and the 5- and 7-envelopes, 1 card.

To deal with subtractions and divisions, we need an extra interactive round to identify the largest integer in a cage, and then we reduce to either an addition or a multiplication verification. To remain zero-knowledge even after the identification of the maximal element, the solution of the cage is mixed with other solutions, with all the other possible maximal elements, before the verifier checks them. Finally, to be able to deal with both addition-/subtractions and multiplications/divisions, we need larger envelopes containing both kind of encodings per cell. The encodings must match. For instance, a 6 in a grid of size 9 is encoded by a large envelope containing: 6 black cards and 3 red cards (just like for Kakuro); but also a small 2-envelope marked with a 2 and containing 1 black card and 2 red cards; similarly, a small 3-envelope with 1 black card and 1 red card; a small 5-envelope with 1 red card and a small 7-envelope with 1 red card. This works also for the value 1, encoded with  $p$ -envelopes containing only red cards.

**Setup:** Our ZKP scheme works as follows for a grid of size  $n$ :

- In each cell, we place three identical envelopes encoding the number of the solution, in both encodings.
- For each subtraction cage with  $c \geq 2$  cells of target  $t$ , let  $max$  be the maximal value in the  $c$  cells and  $c_i \geq 1$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, c-1$ , the other values in any order. Then  $t = max - \sum_{i=1}^{c-1} c_i$  and  $n \geq max = t + \sum_{i=1}^{c-1} c_i \geq t + (c-1)$ . We thus place at most  $(n - t - c + 1)$  large envelopes next to the grid. Each of these envelopes contains: one marked small envelope (itself containing  $n$  cards) and  $n(c-1)$  other black or red cards. The number of black cards in the small envelope minus the number of other black cards must match the target. These  $(n - t - c + 1)$  large envelopes contain all combinations (corresponding to distinct maximal elements) except the one from the solution.
- Each division cage with  $c$  cells of target  $t$  must contain a maximal element divisible by  $t$  and by the  $c-1$  other elements. This maximal element must be less or equal than  $n$  and larger or equal than  $t$ . We denote by  $u$  the number of possible maximal elements,  $u = |\{m, n \geq m \geq t \text{ and } m/t \in \mathbb{N}\}| \leq (n-t+1)$ . Then we place  $u-1$  large envelopes next to the grid. Each of these large envelopes contains: a full set of  $p$ -envelopes and another envelope, marked, itself containing a full set of  $p$ -envelopes, for all primes  $p \leq n$ . For each prime  $p$ , the number of black cards in the  $p$ -envelopes of the marked envelope minus the number of black cards in the other  $p$ -envelope equals the exponent of  $p$  within the factorization of the target  $t$ . For instance if the target is 4 and the 2-envelope within the marked envelope contains 3 black cards, then the other 2-envelope in the large envelope must contain exactly 1 black card. A complete example for a division cage is given below.

**Verification:** Once all placements are done, the verifier randomly picks envelopes placed on each cell and perform the following verifications:

- To verify that each number appears only once per row and column, the verifier randomly picks for each line and for each column one envelope per cell. This packet is shuffled by the shuffle functionality, and then the verifier opens all the envelopes and check that all numbers appear exactly once. Moreover, the verifier checks that both encodings coincide, that is that the exponents within the  $p$ -envelopes coincide with the factorization of the number of black cards.
- For each addition cage, the verifier randomly picks one envelope per cell. Then he opens all the envelopes and discards (or gives back to the prover) all its  $p$ -envelopes without opening them. Finally, as in Kakuro, the verifier mixes the black and red card from all envelopes face down, asks the shuffle functionality to shuffle them and then verifies that the number of black cards corresponds to the target number.
- For each subtraction cage, there is an extra interactive round:
  1. The verifier randomly picks one envelope per cell in the cage, and asks the shuffle functionality to shuffle them;
  2. The verifier gives to the prover these envelopes, one at a time, after discarding (or giving back to the prover);
  3. The prover looks inside, and has two possibilities:
    - If the envelope does not contain the maximum of the cage, the prover gives back the envelope unmodified to the verifier.
    - Otherwise the prover marks the envelope (in view of the verifier, for instance with a pencil) and gives the marked envelope back to the verifier.

If there are multiple copies of a maximum element in the cage, the prover randomly chooses which one to mark.

$\div 2$	

$\div 2$	
1	6
3	1

■ **Figure 6** A  $2 \times 2$  division cage and one solution within a  $9 \times 9$  KenKen grid.

4. The verifier empties all the envelopes, but the one marked by the prover, into a larger envelope (all these cards are shuffled using the functionality) and discard all the  $p$ -envelopes.
  5. The verifier adds the marked envelope, still sealed, to the same larger envelope.
  6. The verifier asks the shuffle functionality to shuffle this larger envelope with the  $(n - t)$  other large envelopes associated to the subtraction cage. Then the verifier opens all large envelopes, checks that each large envelope satisfies the target (black cards in the marked envelope minus the free black cards in the large envelope equals the target) and checks that the  $n - t + 1$  possible combinations are present exactly once.
- For each multiplication cage of target  $t$ , the verifier randomly picks one envelope per cell and opens them all. He discards (or gives back to the prover) the free black and red cards without returning them. Then, one prime  $p$  at a time, he empties all the associated small  $p$ -envelopes, mixes all the black and red cards, asks the shuffle functionality to shuffle them and then verifies that the number of black cards is the exponent of the prime factor  $p$  in the factorization of  $t$ .
  - For each division cage, we mix the subtraction and multiplication protocols: as in the subtraction, the prover and the verifier enter an interactive extra round to mark an envelope containing a maximal element; then for each of the  $u$  possible maximal elements, there is a set of possible multiplicative solutions. There is a complete example below.

This protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times where  $\mathfrak{K}$  is a chosen security parameter. The protocol can be verified in *polynomial time*. This stems from the fact that the prime factors are all lower than  $n$ . Therefore, even factoring the target numbers is just looking at greatest common divisors between  $t$  and values from 2 to  $n$ .

## 5.2 Example of a division cage setup for KenKen

To illustrate our construction, we use the division cage with  $c = 4$  cells given in Figure 6.

Suppose the cage in the figure is part of an  $9 \times 9$  grid and that the solution is the one given, that is  $2 = 6/3/1/1$ . As  $9 = 3^2$  and  $8 = 2^3$ , the maximal exponents for 2, 3, 5 and 7, will be bounded by 3, 2, 1 and 1, respectively, and denoted by  $e_2$ ,  $e_3$ ,  $e_5$  and  $e_7$ , respectively. There are  $u = 4$  possible maximal elements (2, 4, 6, and 8) because  $n = 9$  and the target number is 2. Moreover, as this cage contains  $c = 4$  cells, the maximal elements are divided by 3 numbers. For instance, not counting orders, the target can be obtained with the following solutions (one per possible maximum):  $2 = 8/2/2/1$ ;  $2 = 6/3/1/1$ ;  $2 = 4/2/1/1$ ;  $2 = 2/1/1/1$ .

**Setup:** For each cell of the initial cage the prover places, according to his solution, the following envelopes, where the number of cards contained in a  $p$ -envelope is  $e_p$ :

1. For each one of the two 1's he places three identical envelopes containing each:
  - To verify addition and subtraction: 1 black card and 8 red cards,



- To verify multiplication and division: a 2-envelope with  $e_2 = 3$  red cards, a 3-envelope with  $e_3 = 2$  red cards, a 5-envelope with  $e_5 = 1$  red card, a 7-envelope with  $e_7 = 1$  red cards;
- 2. For the 3 he places three identical envelopes containing each:
  - To verify addition and subtraction verification: 3 black cards and 6 red cards,
  - To verify multiplication and division: a 2-envelope with  $e_2 = 3$  red cards, a 3-envelope with 1 black card and  $e_3 - 1 = 1$  red card, a 5-envelope with  $e_5 = 1$  red card, a 7-envelope with  $e_7 = 1$  red card;
- 3. For the 6: three identical envelopes containing each:
  - To verify addition and subtraction: 6 black cards and 3 red cards,
  - To verify multiplication and division: a 2-envelope with 1 black card and  $e_2 - 1 = 2$  red cards, a 3-envelope with 1 black card and  $e_3 - 1 = 1$  red card, a 5-envelope with  $e_5 = 1$  red card, a 7-envelope with  $e_7 = 1$  red card;

Furthermore, the prover prepares three large envelopes next to the grid:

1. One for the maximal element 8, containing the encoding of  $2^1 \cdot 2^1 \cdot 1$ :
  - A 2-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_2 = 9$  cards including 2 black and  $3 \cdot e_2 - 2 = 7$  red cards.
  - A 3-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_3 = 6$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_3$  red cards.
  - A 5-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_5 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_5$  red cards.
  - A 7-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_7 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_7$  red cards.
  - A marked envelope containing the encoding of  $8 = 2^3 \cdot 3^0 \cdot 5^0 \cdot 7^0$ :
    - A 2-envelope that contains  $e_2 = 3$  cards including 3 black cards and 0 red card.
    - A 3-envelope that contains  $e_3 = 2$  cards including 0 black card and 2 red cards.
    - A 5-envelope that contains  $e_5 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
    - A 7-envelope that contains  $e_7 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
2. One for the maximal element 4, containing the encoding of  $2^1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ :
  - A 2-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_2 = 9$  cards including 1 black card and  $3 \cdot e_2 - 1 = 8$  red cards.
  - A 3-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_3 = 6$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_3$  red cards.
  - A 5-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_5 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_5$  red cards.
  - A 7-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_7 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_7$  red cards.
  - A marked envelope containing the encoding of  $4 = 2^2 \cdot 3^0 \cdot 5^0 \cdot 7^0$ :
    - A 2-envelope that contains  $e_2 = 3$  cards including 2 black cards and 1 red card.
    - A 3-envelope that contains  $e_3 = 2$  cards including 0 black card and 2 red cards.
    - A 5-envelope that contains  $e_5 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
    - A 7-envelope that contains  $e_7 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
3. One for the maximal element 2, containing the encoding of  $1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ :
  - A 2-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_2 = 9$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_2$  red cards.
  - A 3-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_3 = 6$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_3$  red cards.
  - A 5-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_5 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_5$  red cards.
  - A 7-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_7 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and  $3 \cdot e_7$  red cards.
  - A marked envelope containing the encoding of  $2 = 2^1 \cdot 3^0 \cdot 5^0 \cdot 7^0$ :
    - A 2-envelope that contains  $e_2 = 3$  cards including 1 black card and 2 red cards.
    - A 3-envelope that contains  $e_3 = 2$  cards including 0 black card and 2 red cards.
    - A 5-envelope that contains  $e_5 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
    - A 7-envelope that contains  $e_7 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.

**Verification:** The cards that are intended for addition or subtraction are discarded. The verifier and the prover start the round to mark the envelope of the 6. Then the verifier merges the remaining  $p$ -envelopes. Thus, the large envelope contains at the end:

- A 2-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_2 = 9$  cards including 0 black card and 9 red cards, encoding the sum of exponents of 2 for  $3^1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ ;
- A 3-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_3 = 6$  cards including 1 black card and 5 red cards, encoding the sum of exponents of 3 for  $3^1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ ;
- A 5-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_5 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and 3 red cards, encoding the sum of exponents of 5 for  $3^1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ ;
- A 7-envelope that contains  $3 \cdot e_7 = 3$  cards including 0 black card and 3 red cards, encoding the sum of exponents of 7 for  $3^1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$ ;
- A marked envelope containing the encoding of  $6 = 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5^0 \cdot 7^0$ :
  - A 2-envelope that contains  $e_2 = 3$  cards including 1 black card and 2 red cards.
  - A 3-envelope that contains  $e_3 = 2$  cards including 1 black card and 1 red card.
  - A 5-envelope that contains  $e_5 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.
  - A 7-envelope that contains  $e_7 = 1$  cards including 0 black card and 1 red card.

This large envelope is then shuffled by the shuffle functionality with the 3 other large envelopes prepared in the setup phase. Then the verifier checks that those 4 envelopes encode one possible cage solution for each maximum number, namely, 8, 6, 4 and 2. That is, in each of those four large envelopes, for each prime  $p$ , the differences in terms of black cards between both  $p$ -envelopes always gives the prime factor decomposition of the target, 2.

### 5.3 Security Proofs for KenKen

Now we prove the security of our algorithm.

► **Lemma 10 (KenKen Completeness).** *If  $P$  knows a solution of a given KenKen grid, then he is able to convince  $V$ .*

**Proof.** Unicity in rows/columns as well as correctness of addition cages follows from the completeness of the Kakuro protocol in Lemma 7. Correctness for the subtraction comes from the fact that if  $k$  is a maximal element in a cage, then the sum of all the remaining elements in the cage is equal to  $k - t$  (note that this implies that  $k$  must be larger than  $t$ ). Correctness for the multiplication of target  $t$  is guaranteed for each prime  $p$ : when mixed, the number of black cards in all the  $p$ -envelopes is exactly the exponent of  $p$  in the factorization of the target  $t$ . Similarly, for the division, for each possible maximal element  $k$ , the verifier checks by multiplications that the set of factors always yield  $k/t$ . ◀

In order for the protocol to be acceptable its verification phase should at least remain polynomial with the size of the grid. We show that this is indeed the case in Lemma 11.

► **Lemma 11 (KenKen Complexity).** *The number of operations to verify a KenKen grid is polynomial in the size  $n$  of the grid.*

**Proof.** It is easy to see that the addition and subtraction protocols are linearly checked. For the unicity checks, as well as for the multiplication and division cages, we have to consider the number of distinct possible prime factors. By classical number theory (see for instance, [19, (2.18)]) the number of prime factors below  $n$  is  $\mathcal{O}(n/\log(n))$ . So checking a multiplication cage can be done with that number of prime exponent checks, just like checking the correspondence of the encodings in each cell, and checking a division is performed with at most  $n$  multiplication checks (one for each possible maximal element in a cage). Then

each target  $t$  is at most  $(n!)^n$ , so each exponent is at most  $\log_2(t) \leq n \log_2(n!) \leq n^2 \log_2(n)$ . Finally the number of cages in a grid is at most  $n^2$ , so a very rough bound on the number of operations for the verifier is  $n^{5+o(1)}$ . ◀

► **Lemma 12** (KenKen Soundness). *If  $P$  does not provide a solution of a given KenKen grid, then he is not able to convince  $V$  except with a negligible probability  $p = (1/3)^{\mathfrak{K}}$  when the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times.*

**Proof.** As for Kakuro, separately checking unicity rules, addition or multiplication is perfectly sound. For subtraction, the prover could mark an element of the cage which is not maximal. But then the subtraction would yield a negative result, necessarily different from the target. Therefore checking the subtraction alone is also perfectly sound. A similar argument works for the division. Therefore, in a similar way as for Kakuro (Lemma 8) the prover is always caught by the protocol as a liar if he places the large envelopes such that each cell has three identical envelopes. Thus again, the only way a cheating prover can cheat is by placing on a cell, say cell  $a$ , three envelopes that do not all contains the same value. Then at least one value is distinct from the other two, and the probability to randomly pick it for the rule needing it is lower than  $1/3$ . As the protocol is repeated  $\mathfrak{K}$  times, the probability that  $P$  convinces  $V$  without the solution is bounded by  $(1/3)^{\mathfrak{K}}$ , which is negligible. ◀

► **Lemma 13** (KenKen Zero-Knowledge).  *$V$  learns nothing about  $P$ 's solution of a given KenKen grid.*

**Proof.** The same kind of simulator as for Lemma 9 can be used: for unicity and addition rules the simulator is directly that of Kakuro. Similarly, for multiplication, subtraction and division cages, the verifiers look at the colors of the cards only during the final step of the verification phase, and only after a last shuffle by the prover. Therefore, in this penultimate step, the simulator can use its ability to replace shuffles by his choice of envelopes that satisfy the expected rule. Once again, this is indistinguishable from those provided by an honest prover. ◀

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we devised a solution that allows Cobra to solve his friend's dilemma for both games. Akira can now prove to Totoro that she knows a solution to his Akari problem without revealing his solution, and Totoro can prove to Akira that he knows a solution to his Takuzu problem without revealing it either. The same is true for Ken and Kakarotto playing Kakuro and KenKen.

We showed that our solutions are secure, that is complete, sound and zero-knowledge. Moreover, we do not use any cryptographic primitives, but only cards, paper and envelopes.

As future work, we would like to investigate other similar games. For example, we would like to analyse Futoshiki, which can be seen has a variation of Sudoku with additional constraints on the order of the numbers, or Hitori, which has the constraint that all unmarked cells need to be connected, unlike any constraint in the games analysed in this paper.

---

## References

- 1 Michael Ben-Or, Oded Goldreich, Shafi Goldwasser, Johan Håstad, Joe Kilian, Silvio Micali, and Phillippe Rogaway. Everything provable is provable in zero-knowledge. In *CRYPTO'88*, pages 37–56. Springer, 1990.

- 2 Marzio De Biasi. Binary puzzle is NP-complete. 2012. URL: <http://www.nearly42.org/vdisk/cstheory/binaryp.pdf>.
- 3 Manuel Blum, Paul Feldman, and Silvio Micali. Non-interactive zero-knowledge and its applications. In *STOC'88*, pages 103–112. ACM, 1988.
- 4 Yu-Feng Chien and Wing-Kai Hon. Cryptographic and physical zero-knowledge proof: From sudoku to nonogram. In *Fun with Algorithms, 5th International Conference, FUN'10*, volume 6099 of *LNCS*, pages 102–112, 2010.
- 5 Erik D. Demaine. Playing games with algorithms: Algorithmic combinatorial game theory. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2001*, volume 2136 of *LNCS*, pages 18–32, 2001.
- 6 Jannik Dreier, Hugo Jonker, and Pascal Lafourcade. Secure auctions without cryptography. In *Fun with Algorithms, 7th International Conference, FUN'14*, pages 158–170, 2014.
- 7 Oded Goldreich and Ariel Kahan. How to construct constant-round zero-knowledge proof systems for NP. *Journal of Cryptology*, 9(3):167–189, 1991.
- 8 Shafi Goldwasser, Silvio Micali, and Charles Rackoff. The knowledge complexity of interactive proof-systems. In *STOC'85*, pages 291–304. ACM, 1985.
- 9 Ronen Gradwohl, Moni Naor, Benny Pinkas, and Guy N. Rothblum. Cryptographic and physical zero-knowledge proof systems for solutions of sudoku puzzles. In *Fun with Algorithms, 4th International Conference, FUN'07*, pages 166–182. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- 10 Kazuya Haraguchi and Hirotaka Ono. BLOCKSUM is NP-complete. *IEICE Transactions*, 96-D(3):481–488, 2013.
- 11 Kazuya Haraguchi and Hirotaka Ono. How simple algorithms can solve latin square completion-type puzzles approximately. *JIP*, 23(3):276–283, 2015.
- 12 Graham Kendall, Andrew J. Parkes, and Kristian Spoerer. A survey of NP-complete puzzles. *ICGA Journal*, 31(1):13–34, 2008.
- 13 Jonas Kölker. *I/O-Efficient Multiparty Computation, Formulaic Secret Sharing and NP-Complete Puzzles*. PhD thesis, Aarhus University, 2012.
- 14 Brandon McPhail. Light up is NP-complete. feb 2005. URL: <http://www.mountainvistasoft.com/docs/lightup-is-np-complete.pdf>.
- 15 Alfred J. Menezes, Scott A. Vanstone, and Paul C. Van Oorschot. *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL, USA, 1st edition, 1996.
- 16 Takaaki Mizuki and Hiroki Shizuya. Practical card-based cryptography. In *Fun with Algorithms, 7th International Conference, FUN'14*, pages 313–324, 2014.
- 17 Moni Naor, Yael Naor, and Omer Reingold. Applied kid cryptography or how to convince your children you are not cheating. In *Eurocrypt'94*, pages 1–12, 1999.
- 18 Jean-Jacques Quisquater, Myriam Quisquater, Muriel Quisquater, Michaël Quisquater, Louis Guillou, Marie Annick Guillou, Gaïd Guillou, Anna Guillou, Gwenolé Guillou, Soazig Guillou, and Thomas A. Berson. How to explain zero-knowledge protocols to your children. In *CRYPTO'89*, pages 628–631. Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- 19 J. Barkley Rosser and Lowell Schoenfeld. Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 6:64–94, 1962.
- 20 Dennis Shasha. Upstart puzzles: Proving without teaching/teaching without proving. *Commun. ACM*, 57(11):120–120, 2014.
- 21 Will Shortz. *Easy Kakuro: 100 Addictive Logic Puzzles*. St. Martin's Griffin, 2006.
- 22 Seta Takahiro. The complexities of puzzles, cross sum and their another solution problems(asp). Master's thesis, University of Tokyo, 2001.
- 23 Putranto Hadi Utomo and Ruud Pellikaan. Binary puzzles as an erasure decoding problem. In *Proceedings of the 36th WIC Symposium on Information Theory in the Benelux*, pages 129–134, 2015.