Number Theory (part 3): Cryptography and Related Topics (by Evan Dummit, 2022, v. 3.00)

Contents

3 Cryptography and Related Topics

In this chapter, we give a brief introduction to modern cryptography and related topics. Much of modern cryptography makes heavy use of modular arithmetic and number theory, and most of these methods rely on the assumed difficulty of solving one or more problems in number theory, such as computing discrete logarithms, factoring large integers, and computing square roots modulo composite integers.

We will first discuss some pre-modern cryptosystems, pointing out the flaws that ultimately led to their abandonment. We then discuss modern "public-key" cryptosystems and a number of related procedures (e.g., for secret key creation and two-party authentication), and compare their relative strengths and weaknesses. There are many other cryptographic algorithms used in practice today, but many of them are substantially similar to the examples we give.

Effective implementation of these cryptosystems requires generating large primes that can be quickly proven to be prime, and on the assumed difficulty of factoring large integers, so we close with a discussion of primality testing and some factorization algorithms.

3.1 Overview of Cryptography

- Cryptography is the name given to encoding and transmitting information in a way that makes it difficult for someone else to intercept and use.
  - Many of the earliest uses of cryptography were to send secure military information and orders that could not be decoded by enemy forces.
  - In the modern day, secure cryptography is at the heart of global commerce, as it allows consumers, merchants, and banks to exchange purchasing information without anyone else being able to eavesdrop.
- In analysis of cryptography, it is useful to have a standard list of placeholder names:
  - Alice and Bob refer to two parties attempting to exchange information. (Generally, Alice wants to send a message to Bob, though the communication can be two-directional.)
  - Eve refers to a non-malicious eavesdropper, who can listen in to the communications between Alice and Bob, but will not alter them.
  - Mallory refers to a malicious eavesdropper, who can listen to Alice and Bob's communications and may also attempt to impersonate them or alter their messages.
- In general, a cryptographic system works as follows:
  - Alice wishes to send a secure message to Bob.
  - Alice takes her unencrypted message, her plaintext, and encrypts it somehow to obtain a ciphertext.
  - Alice then sends the ciphertext to Bob, who then decodes it to recover Alice's original message.
- We will write plaintexts in **bold lowercase** and ciphertexts in **BOLD UPPERCASE**.
  - For the ease of readability, when it is reasonable we will include spaces (becauseitishardtoreadalengthy-textwithnospaces) when rendering plaintexts and ciphertexts, but when we encode messages we will not use the spaces.
- An effective cryptosystem must strike a reasonable balance between the following:
  1. Being straightforward enough that Alice can easily encode the message.
  2. Transmitting the information faithfully so that the ciphertext can be decoded correctly by Bob.
  3. Being secure enough that, if Eve intercepts the ciphertext, she cannot recover the original plaintext.
- There are other kinds of attacks on a simple messaging system that cryptography can also addess:
  1. Eve could want to decipher just the one message Alice sent, or she may want a method for reading all messages that Alice has sent. If Alice's procedure is not secure enough, it is possible that if Eve can decode a single message then she can decode all of Alice's other messages too.
  2. A more malicious individual, Mallory, may want not only to read the message, but to alter it before passing it on to Bob in such a way that Bob thinks Alice sent the altered message.
  3. Mallory may also want to pretend to be Bob and communicate with Alice in a way that makes it seem as if she is actually communicating with Bob.
- Historically, most cryptography relied on making the message appear nonsensical and unreadable, or by hiding it in some other more innocuous location (e.g., by encoding the message in the first letter of each word in a document).
  - This latter procedure is sometimes called steganography, the hiding of secret information in plain sight. It is also interesting, but is not really the purpose of cryptography.
  - The security of steganography comes only from the obscurity of the method used: once an adversary learns of the procedure being used to hide the information, it is trivial for them to obtain it.

- The true strength of cryptography comes from the fact that it is possible to design procedures that, even if Eve has full knowledge of how Alice encoded her message, Eve still cannot decode it.

- There have been very many attempts at designing secure cryptosystems[1], so we cannot come close to describing them all. Instead, we will discuss two fairly old cryptosystems that are easy to implement by hand.

3.1.1 Substitution Ciphers

- One of the most classical cryptosystems is the Caesar shift algorithm (so named because it was supposedly used by Julius Caesar): simply shift each letter of the plaintext forward a fixed number of letters in the alphabet (wrapping around from Z to A, as needed).
  - Thus, shifting the plaintext **evil hal** 1 letter forward produces **FUJM IBM**.
  - The Caesar shift is quite easy to break for a number of reasons, the most obvious of which is that each message has only 26 different possible encodings, and all of them can be rapidly written down by shifting the encrypted message forward by 1 letter 25 separate times.

- An equivalent way to think of this substitution cipher is that it replaces each letter of the plaintext in some predetermined fashion (e.g., $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{W}$, $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{C}$, and so forth).
  - It is a simple count to see that the number of such functions is $26! \approx 4.03 \cdot 10^{26}$: this is simply the number of ways to permute the 26 possible symbols.
  - Obviously, a brute force decoding will not be effective against a general substitution cipher: even simply to store all of the possible decodings of a 100-character message would take approximately $4 \cdot 10^{16}$ terabytes of storage space. (For comparison, the total amount of internet traffic worldwide in 2013 was estimated to be on the order of $4 \cdot 10^{7}$ terabytes.)

- If Eve has access to the encoding or decoding mechanism, or to a plaintext/ciphertext pair, she can easily extract the 26 letter substitutions underlying the cipher.
  - For example, if Eve has the encoding mechanism, she can ask it to encode the message **abcdefgh...z** to determine the encoding of each letter.
  - If she has the decoding mechanism, she can ask it to decode **ABCDEFGH...Z**: she can then decode any message.
  - If she has a plaintext/ciphertext pair, she needs only find each letter in the plaintext and corresponding ciphertext to make a table of the encodings.

- It is less obvious how Eve can attack a substitution cipher if she only has the ciphertext: a brute-force method is obviously not going to succeed given the total number of possible keys.

- The standard method for attacking a substitution cipher is a procedure known as frequency analysis: since each appearance of any given letter in the ciphertext always corresponds to the same letter in the plaintext, if we count the frequency of each letter in the ciphertext, we can compare them to the typical letter frequencies in English to try to find the correspondence.
  - Here are the frequencies of the 26 English letters (the nonsense phrase "etaoin shrdlcu" is often used as a mnemonic to remember the order of the common letters):

Letter	e	t	a	o	i	n	s	h	r	d	l	c	u
Frequency	12.7%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	7.0%	6.7%	6.3%	6.1%	6.0%	4.3%	4.0%	2.8%	2.8%
Letter	m	w	f	g	y	p	b	v	k	j	x	q	z
Frequency	2.4%	2.4%	2.3%	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%	1.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%

[1] Some of the simpler historical examples of cryptosystems include the rail fence cipher, the Playfair cipher, the four-square cipher, the ADFGX and ADFGVX ciphers, the Hill cipher, and the trifid cipher. We refer the interested reader elsewhere for details.

- Presuming the ciphertext is sufficiently long, counting the frequency of letters allows the original message to be partially decoded.
- To get further, we can repeat the frequency analysis with pairs of consecutive letters ("digrams") or triples ("trigrams"): we can search for pairs or triples of consecutive letters that occur in the text and compare them to a list of common English digrams and trigrams.
- In English, the most common digrams are **th** and **he**, followed by **in**, **an**, **er**, **re**, **ed**, **on**, **es**, **ea**, **ti**, **st**, **en**, **at**. For doubled letters, **ll**, **tt**, **ee**, **ss** are the most common. The most common trigram is **the**, followed by **ing**, **and**, **ere**, **her**.
- Once the ciphertext has been partially decoded, the rest of the message can generally be inferred from context (i.e., from partly decoded words that have only one obvious possible completion). For example, the partly decoded word **Zotato** is probably **potato**.
- Actually decoding a substitution cipher usually requires some amount of trial and error or guesswork, since short messages will often have letter frequencies that do not actually match the averages for typical English text.

- Example: Decode the message below, which is encrypted with a substitution cipher.

```
KB TI BQ NBK KB TI KRZK PF KRI XAIFKPBN DRIKRIQ KPF NBTHIQ PN KRI YPNC KB FAWWIQ
KRI FHPNOF ZNC ZQQBDF BW BAKQZOIBAF WBQKANI BQ KB KZGI ZQYF ZOZPNFK Z FIZ BW
KQBATHIF ZNC TJ BEEBFPNO INC KRIY
```

  - We first compute the frequencies of the letters in the message. Of the 404 characters, there are 19 occurrences of **K**, 18 of **B**, 17 of **I**, 13 of **F**, 12 of **N**, 11 of **Q** and **Z**, and fewer than 10 of each remaining letter.
  - For digrams, there are 6 occurrences of **KR** and **RI**, 5 of **PN**, and 4 of **KB**, **QK**, and **NC**. There are also 5 occurrences of **KRI**.
  - These facts suggest that **K** is **t**, that **R** is **h**, and that **I** is **e**. Making these substitutions produces the following:

```
tB Te BQ NBt tB Te thZt PF the XAeFtPBN DhetheQ tPF NBTHeQ PN the YPNC tB FAWWeQ
the FHPNOF ZNC ZQQBDF BW BAtQZOeBAF WBQtANe BQ tB tZGe ZQYF ZOZPNFt Z FeZ BW
tQBATHeF ZNC TJ BEEBFPNO eNC theY
```

  - The letter **B** is likely to be the among the letters **a**, **i**, **o**, **n**, **s**. Based on the words it already appears in, such as **tB**, it is most likely to be **o**. Similarly, the letter **Z** is likely to be **a** since it is common and appears in the word **thZt**, and also is a word by itself.

```
to Te oQ Not to Te that PF the XAeFtPoN DhetheQ tPF NoTHeQ PN the YPNC to FAWWeQ
the FHPNOF aNC aQQoDF oW oAtQaOeoAF WoQtANe oQ to taGe aQYF aOaPNFt a Fea oW
tQoATHeF aNC TJ oEEoFPNO eNC theY
```

  - At this stage we can try to complete partial words like **DhetheQ** using a dictionary search (which returns only the one possibility **whether**), which in turn will lead us to other reasonable guesses for words like **aQQoDF/arrowF** (**arrows**) and **PF/Ps** (**is**):

```
to Te or Not to Te that is the XAestioN whether tis NoTHer iN the YiNC to sAWWer
the sHiNOs aNC arrows oW oAtraOeoAs WortANe or to taGe arYs aOaiNst a sea oW
troATHes aNC TJ oEEosiNO eNC theY
```

  - At this point we essentially have enough letters in most of the words to be able to fill in the remainder, which we can recognize as the beginning of Hamlet's famous soliloquy:

```
to be or not to be that is the question whether tis nobler in the mind to suffer
the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune or to take arms against a sea of
troubles and by opposing end them
```

- There are many other classical cryptosystems (most of which are much stronger than simple substitution ciphers!) that have been developed and used throughout history.

- A number of methods, which generally fall under the name polyalphabetic ciphers, have been devised to try to get around this problem: the ultimate idea is to use different alphabets for encoding different letters of the ciphertext, rather than encoding every letter in the same way. Examples of such cryptosystems include the Vigenère cipher (often called the "keyword cipher" since it uses a single word or phrase for its encryption), running-key ciphers (often called "book codes" since the encryption usually uses a passage from a book), and one-time pads (which use a randomly generated pad of text for their encryption).
- One way to do this is simply to encrypt multiple letters at a time in a single block, in order to try to avoid being susceptible to the kind of single-letter counting that the substitution cipher is vulnerable to: such ciphers are generally called block ciphers. Examples of such cryptosystems include the Playfair and four-square ciphers, which both use a keyword and letter grid to encode two letters at a time.
- Other methods instead attempt to flatten out the frequency distribution using different encoding procedures, or change the encoding alphabet in some less predictable way.
- Another class of methods, called transposition ciphers, will rearrange the plaintext characters in a predetermined way so as to jumble up the message.
- It is of course possible to combine the two procedures of encoding letters with different alphabets and rearranging the letter orders, such as in the ADFGX/ADFGVX ciphers, which combine a letter substitution with a transposition cipher.

3.1.2 Symmetric and Asymmetric Cryptosystems

- All of the classical cryptosystems we have previously discussed are examples of symmetric cryptosystems: the information required to encode a message is the same as the information required to decode a message.
  - For example, the key for encoding a Caesar shift is an integer k giving the number of letters the message is shifted forward. The knowledge of the integer k allows one both to encode and decode a message.
- We will mention that there are several symmetric cryptosystems that are in current use and considered to be strong: it is avowedly not the case that symmetric cryptosystems are inherently vulnerable to simple attacks the way the historical cryptosystems we discussed are.
- One such symmetric cryptosystem that was adopted as a national standard for unclassified data by the United States in 1977 is known as the Data Encryption Standard (DES).
  - The DES cryptosystem was a 64-bit block cipher (meaning that it operated on blocks of data 64 bits in length), with a key length of 56 bits. 8 bits were devoted to parity checks, in order to detect errors in data transmission.
  - To describe the system in detail would take a great deal of time and effort. Ultimately, our interest is not in the specific details of the system, but rather in the basic idea behind it: the system operates on a data block by applying 16 identical stages of processing called "rounds", each of which scrambles the block according to a particular nonlinear procedure dictated by the key and the algorithm.
  - Much is known about the security of DES, as it was the subject of significant research, but it turns out that there are few attacks that are much faster than a simple brute-force search.
  - Various procedures were developed to quicken a brute-force search, and a direct approach to breaking the cipher takes on the order of 2^{43} calculations. To give an idea of how feasible such an attack is, to store the result of 2^{43} single-bit calculations would require a mere 1 terabyte of data storage, less than a typical desktop computer hard drive.
  - Ultimately, owing to the small key size, DES was phased out in the 1980s, and in 1999 a single DES key was broken in less than 24 hours.
- In the 1980s, a sufficient number of security concerns about DES, as well as some concerns about the slowness of the algorithm itself when implemented in software (it was originally designed for hardware implementation), motivated the deployment of additional block cipher algorithms.
  - Many of these simply reused the basic structure of DES but increased the size of the data blocks, the size of the key, or the number of rounds.

  - Most such algorithms are proprietary, although there are some such as Blowfish that are open-source, and others that are proprietary but available royalty-free such as CAST-128.

- The generally-considered successor to DES is known as the Advanced Encryption System (AES) and also known as Rijndael, from a portmanteau of its creators' names (Joan Daemen and Vincent Rijmen).
  - The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) held an open competition for the successor to DES in the late 1990s, and, following a lengthy evaluation, Rijndael was eventually selected from the 15 submissions as satisfying the constraints of security, efficiency, and portability.
  - Part of the motivation for the open and lengthy evaluation process were some suspicions (of varying legitimacy) about whether previous algorithms like DES had hidden "backdoors" built in.
  - The AES cipher is a 128-bit block cipher with possible key lengths of 128, 192, or 256 bits, and operates in a similar manner to DES, invoking a number of rounds of operations (10, 12, or 14) each of which rearranges and transforms the block according to the key.
  - It is generally believed that AES is resistant to most kinds of direct attacks, and it has been approved by the US government for use on classified information.
  - Current estimates place the computational difficulty of breaking a single 128-bit AES key, using the best known attacks, at roughly 2^{96} operations in a worst-case scenario, with an expected number of operations typically closer to 2^{126}, and an estimated memory requirement of about 2^{56} bits (approximately 4 million terabytes).

- One of the fundamental drawbacks of symmetric cryptosystems is that, by definition, being able to encode a message is equivalent to being able to decode a message. But there are certain situations where we might prefer to have an <u>asymmetric cryptosystem</u>, one in which the encoding and decoding procedures are sufficiently different that being able to encode messages does not imply that one can decode them.
  - For example, a fundamental issue with symmetric cryptosystems is that of key exchange: if Alice and Bob want to communicate via a symmetric cryptosystem over a long distance, they must first share the key with one another, but they require a method that will not allow Eve to learn the key. They could do this by using a different cryptosystem, but again: how do they decide what key to use for the second cryptosystem, and how do they tell each other without letting Eve know?
  - With an asymmetric system, this is not a problem: Alice simply tells Bob how to send her an encrypted message, and Bob can send her the key they will use for subsequent communications.
  - As another example, if Alice wishes to digitally sign a document to indicate that it belongs to her, she wants it to be easy for anyone to verify that the signature is actually hers, yet also very difficult to decouple the signature from the document itself (because this would allow anyone to forge her signature on a new document).

- It turns out that, perhaps surprisingly, it is possible to create secure cryptosystems in which one can make the encryption method completely public: such systems are known as <u>public-key cryptosystems</u>.
  - Sending a message via public-key encryption is then very easy: Alice simply asks Bob for his public key (and the encryption procedure), and then follows the procedure.
  - Bob can feel free giving her this information even knowing that Eve might also be listening, because of the asymmetry in the cryptosystem: the fact that Eve knows how to encode a message does not mean that she can decode anything.
  - A good analogy for public-key encryption is a locked dropbox: anyone can place an envelope into the dropbox, but only the owner (or at least, the person who has the key) can retrieve the letters from the box.

- Ultimately, public-key cryptosystems revolve around the existence of so-called <u>one-way functions</u>: functions which are easy to evaluate ("easy forward") but very difficult to invert ("hard backward") on most outputs.
  - Many examples of one-way functions come from number theory.
  - As an example, consider the function $f(p, q) = pq$ that takes two prime numbers and outputs their product.

- It is a trivial matter of arithmetic to compute the product pq given p and q, but if we are given pq and asked to find p and q, we would need to know how to factor an arbitrary integer; this is believed to be much, much harder.
- Ultimately, the property that factorization is much harder than multiplication is the basis for many public-key cryptosystems, including the famous RSA cryptosystem, which we will discuss imminently.

3.2 Rabin Encryption

- A simple example of a public-key cryptosystem is the Rabin public-key cryptosystem.
  - This procedure was first published in 1979 by Michael O. Rabin. It is one of the first non-classified public-key cryptosystems, and it is also one of the simplest.
- First, Bob must create his public key.
  - To do this, he simply computes two large primes p and q each congruent to 3 modulo 4.
  - Bob then publishes $N = pq$. This value N is his public key.
- Now suppose that Alice wants to send Bob a message.
  - First, Alice converts her message into an integer m modulo N in some agreed-upon manner.
  - For example, if N has 257 digits in base 2, then Alice could break her message into pieces that are each 256 base-2 digits long, and encode each one separately.
  - If Alice's message is text, she would of course convert it to a number using some fixed text encoding, and then break it into pieces as above.
  - Alice then computes m^2 modulo N and sends the result to Bob.
- If Bob receives a message m^2, then to decode the message Bob needs to compute the square root of m^2 modulo pq.
  - By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, Bob can equivalently find the solutions to $x^2 \equiv a \pmod{p}$ and $x^2 \equiv a \pmod{q}$, where $a = m^2$.
  - Each of these congruences has two solutions, and finding one of them immediately gives the other: $x^2 \equiv m^2 \bmod p$ is equivalent to $p|(x-m)(x+m)$, meaning $x = \pm m \bmod p$.
  - The key observation is that $x = a^{(p+1)/4}$ has the property that $x^2 \equiv a \pmod{p}$: since $a = m^2 \pmod{p}$ and $m^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ by Euler's theorem, we have
  $$x^2 \equiv a^{(p+1)/2} \equiv m^{p+1} \equiv m^2 \equiv a \pmod{p}.$$
  - Therefore, to decrypt the message, Bob must solve the simultaneous congruences $x = \pm a^{(p+1)/4} \pmod{p}$ and $x = \pm a^{(q+1)/4} \pmod{q}$, which he can do easily with the Chinese Remainder Theorem.
- Note that once Bob decrypts the message, he will have four values each of which squares to m^2 modulo N: how does he know which one was actually Alice's original message?
  - Without additional information, Bob cannot determine which of these four values was actually Alice's message.
  - One way of fixing this problem is for Alice to append some particular string of digits to the beginning of her message m: it is then very unlikely that any of the other square roots of m^2 will also start with this string of digits.
- Example: Bob sets up a Rabin public-key cryptosystem with $N = 1817 = 23 \cdot 79$. Alice sends him the encrypted message 347, and tells Bob that the two-digit message was padded with starting digits "11". Decode the message.
  - Decoding requires solving $x^2 \equiv 347 \pmod{1817}$ for x.

- By our analysis, the solutions satisfy $x \equiv \pm 347^{(23+1)/4} \pmod{23}$ and $x \equiv \pm 347^{(79+1)/4} \pmod{79}$.
- Successive squaring yields $x \equiv \pm 18 \pmod{23}$ and $x \equiv \pm 49 \pmod{79}$.
- Using the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we obtain the four solutions $x \equiv \pm 662,\ \pm 741 \pmod{1817}$.
- Hence the original message was one of $x = 662, 741, 1076, 1155$. The only one of these that starts with "11" is $x = 1155$, so the original message was $\boxed{55}$.

- Now suppose that Eve intercepts the encrypted message m^2 and wants to decode it. In order to do this, Eve would need to be able to compute all the square roots of m^2 modulo N.

- We claim that computing these square roots is equivalent to factoring N when N is a product of two primes.
  - Explicitly, suppose that m is a unit modulo N, and we are looking for the solutions of $x^2 \equiv m^2 \pmod{N}$.
  - By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, solving $x^2 \equiv a \pmod{pq}$ is equivalent to solving $x^2 \equiv m^2 \pmod{p}$ and $x^2 \equiv m^2 \pmod{q}$.
  - Observe that $x^2 \equiv m^2 \pmod{p}$ is equivalent to $(x-m)(x+m) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, or $p|(x-m)(x+m)$, from which $x \equiv \pm m \pmod{p}$.
  - Similarly, $x \equiv m^2 \pmod{q}$ is equivalent to $x \equiv \pm m \pmod{q}$.
  - Thus, there are four solutions to the congruence $x^2 \equiv m^2 \pmod{n}$: they are $\pm m$ and $\pm w$, where $w \equiv m \pmod{p}$ and $w \equiv -m \pmod{q}$.
  - Now observe that $w + m \equiv 2m \pmod{p}$ and $w + m \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$, so q divides $w + m$ but p does not. Therefore, $\gcd(w + m, pq) = p$.
  - Therefore, if we are given the three values w, m, and $pq = N$, we can find the value of a prime factor of N, and thus its factorization because N is the product of two primes, by computing $\gcd(w + m, pq)$. (Computing the greatest common divisor is very fast using the Euclidean algorithm.)
  - What this means is: breaking Rabin encryption for a single message is equivalent to factoring N.
  - If p and q are both very large, then it is believed to be extremely difficult to factor N: thus, Eve will be unable to decode Alice's message.

- Rabin encryption is very simple, yet it is easy to prove that breaking it (in general) is equivalent to factoring the public key N. However, it does suffer from some weaknesses of varying severity, of which we will list a few.

- <u>Attack 1</u> (Brute force): If the number of possible plaintexts is small and Eve wants to know how a message decodes, she could simply encrypt all possible plaintexts and compare them to the ciphertext.
  - This is not really a problem of Rabin encryption per se: the same problem exists for any cryptosystem with a small number of possible plaintexts.
  - To avoid this issue, Bob simply needs to choose his value of N to be sufficiently large that it is infeasible for Eve to test every possible plaintext, and then to pad each message with a random string at the beginning (or end), of sufficient length that makes it infeasible for Eve to test all of the possibilities.
  - Padding can also overcome the nonuniqueness of square roots, but (in this case) breaking the encryption is no longer provably equivalent to factorization.

- <u>Attack 2</u> (Chosen-ciphertext): Eve chooses a random message m and asks Bob's decoding machine to decode m^2 for her. Eve then has a good chance of being able to use the result to determine Bob's key.
  - As we explained above, there are four square roots of m^2 modulo n: $\pm m$ and $\pm w$, where w is the solution to $w \equiv m \pmod{p}$ and $w \equiv -m \pmod{q}$.
  - When Bob's computer decodes Eve's message, it has a 50% chance of erroneously assuming that w or $-w$ was actually Eve's message.
  - Suppose it gives Eve the value of w: then by using the attack we described above, $\gcd(m + w, n) = q$ is one of the prime divisors of Bob's public key N.
  - Similarly, if the computer gives Eve the value $-w$, then $\gcd(m - w, N) = p$.

  - Hence, there is a 50% chance that Eve would be able to factor Bob's public key and thus break the encryption.
  - If Even repeats this process a mere ten times, she will be overwhelmingly likely to obtain a factorization of Bob's public key.
  - Bob can attempt to prevent this by never revealing a decrypted message to anyone. But in a computerized implementation of the procedure, this is very hard to manage.

- The second attack is sufficiently serious that (in addition to the rather annoying issue of nonuniqueness of square roots) Rabin encryption, despite being provably equivalent to factorization, is not suitable for modern use.
  - One way to try to fix the problem is to pad each message to make them adhere to a particular format (for example, by encoding messages in blocks of 1024 bits, where the last 128 bits are duplicates of the previous 128) and then refuse to return a decoded message that does not decode to the correct format.
  - It would not be possible to use a chosen-ciphertext attack to get around such a procedure since the number of attempts required to find a ciphertext message whose corresponding plaintext adheres to the correct encoding is on the order of 2^{126} or so (each ciphertext has 4 associated plaintexts, and a random plaintext has a $1/2^{128}$ probability of having the right formatting).
  - However, making any alteration to the Rabin encryption scheme will yield something that is no longer provably equivalent to factorization.

- We will also remark that it is not necessary to restrict the primes to being congruent to 3 modulo 4.
  - This assumption is only made because it is much easier to compute square roots modulo such primes using successive squaring, because $(m^2)^{(p+1)/4} \equiv m \pmod{p}$.
  - There are other fast algorithms to compute square roots modulo primes congruent to 1 modulo 4, such as Berlekamp's factorization algorithm, but they require some further results about polynomials.

3.3 RSA Encryption

- One of the practical issues with the Rabin cryptosystem is the nonuniqueness of square roots, since its encoding function (the squaring map modulo N) is not one-to-one.
- A way to get around this problem is to use a different power map, rather than the squaring map, that is a one-to-one function modulo N: this is the idea behind RSA encryption.
  - The RSA cryptosystem was first publicly described in 1977 by Ron Rivest, Adi Shamir, and Leonard Adleman, from whose surnames the initialism "RSA" was formed.
  - It turns out that an essentially equivalent system had been developed by Clifford Cocks in 1973 while working for Britain's Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ). However, his work was not declassified until 1997, and his system was marginally less general than RSA.

3.3.1 Procedure for RSA

- First, Bob must create his public key.
  - To do this, he first computes two large primes p and q and sets $N = pq$.
  - Bob also chooses an integer e which is relatively prime to $\varphi(N) = (p-1)(q-1)$.
    - Often, $e = 3$ is used. (This requires choosing p and q to be primes congruent to 2 modulo 3.) There are various reasons, which we discuss later, why $e = 3$ is not always a good choice.
    - Another popular choice is $e = 2^{16} + 1 = 65537$, which is prime and also allows for rapid successive squaring.
  - Bob then publishes the two values N and e, which serve as his public key.

- Now suppose that Alice wants to send Bob a message.
  - Alice converts her message into an integer m modulo N in some agreed-upon manner.
  - Alice then computes $c \equiv m^e$ modulo N (using successive squaring) and sends the result to Bob.
- If Bob has received a ciphertext block $c \equiv m^e \pmod{N}$, he wishes to recover the value of m.
  - We claim that Bob can recover m by computing c^d modulo N using successive squaring, where d is the inverse of e modulo $\varphi(N)$.
  - By choosing e to be relatively prime to $\varphi(N)$, such a d will always exist, and Bob can easily compute it via the Euclidean algorithm because he knows $\varphi(N) = (p-1)(q-1)$.
  - Most actual implementations of RSA use the Chinese Remainder Theorem to do the decoding modulo p and modulo q separately, and then combine the results. This is faster since the moduli are much smaller, but it is not strictly necessary.
- One way to show that the decryption procedure will work is via the Chinese Remainder Theorem and Fermat's Little Theorem.
  - Explicitly, since $N = pq$, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem it is enough to show that $c^d \equiv m \pmod{p}$ and $c^d \equiv m \pmod{q}$.
  - By assumption, $de \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(N)}$ and $\varphi(N) = (p-1)(q-1)$, so in particular $de \equiv 1 \pmod{p-1}$, so $de = 1 + k(p-1)$ for some integer k.
  - Now since $c \equiv m^e \pmod{p}$, we have $c^d \equiv m^{de} \equiv m^{1+k(p-1)} \equiv m \cdot (m^{p-1})^k \pmod{p}$.
  - If $m \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ then $c^d \equiv 0 \equiv m \pmod{p}$ so the result holds.
  - Otherwise, if p does not divide m, by Fermat's Little Theorem we have $m^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, so $c^d \equiv m \cdot 1^k \equiv m \pmod{p}$, as claimed.
  - We can use the same argument to see that $c^d \equiv m \pmod{q}$: thus, $c^d \equiv m \pmod{pq}$, as required.
- There is a slightly faster way to see how the procedure works using Euler's theorem.
  - Again, since $c \equiv m^e \pmod{N}$, we obtain $c^d \equiv m^{de} \pmod{N}$.
  - Also, since $de \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(N)}$ we can write $de \equiv 1 + r\varphi(N)$ for some integer r.
  - Then by Euler's theorem, if m is relatively prime to N we have $m^{\varphi(N)} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, so we can write

    $$c^d \equiv m^{de} \equiv m^{1+r\varphi(N)} \equiv m \cdot (m^{\varphi(N)})^r \equiv m \cdot 1^r \equiv m \pmod{N}$$

    as required.
  - Note that technically, this explanation only applies when m is relatively prime to N.
  - In practice, however, this is essentially always the case, since the only time m is not relatively prime to N is when m is divisible by p or by q, which happens only with probability about $1/p + 1/q$.
- Example: Encode, and then decode, the message $m = 444724$ using RSA, with $N = 18\,212\,959$ and $e = 3$.
  - To encode, we simply compute m^3 modulo N, which is $\boxed{12\,534\,939}$.
  - To decode, we first factor $N = 3329 \cdot 5471$, and compute $\varphi(N) = 3328 \cdot 5470 = 18\,204\,160$.
  - Next, we need to find the decryption exponent d, which is the inverse of 3 modulo $\varphi(N) = 18204160$.
  - Applying the Euclidean algorithm will eventually produce the relation $18204160 - 6068053 \cdot 3 = 1$, from which we can see that the inverse is $-6068053 \equiv 12\,136\,107$.
  - Hence $d = 12\,136\,107$.
  - Now we simply compute $12\,534\,939^{12\,136\,107}$ modulo N via successive squaring. (Of course, this requires a computer.)
  - We eventually obtain the decrypted message $\boxed{444\,724}$, which is, of course, what we should have gotten.

- It is clear from our description that RSA is fairly straightforward to implement, at least in principle.
  - The encoding and decoding procedures only require successive squaring, which is quite fast.
  - Bob's computation of the decryption exponent d requires the Euclidean algorithm, which is also quite fast.
  - It is not so obvious, however, that RSA is secure.
- Suppose Eve is spying on Alice and Bob.
  - Eve will have the values of N and e, since those are public, and she will also have the ciphertext $c \equiv m^e \pmod{N}$.
  - Thus, Eve's goal is to solve the congruence $m^e \equiv c \pmod{N}$ for m, given the values of e, c, N.
- One way for Eve to try to decode the message is for her to find the decryption exponent d.
  - Suppose the order of m modulo N is r: then Eve needs to find is a d such that r divides $ed - 1$.
  - To see this: if $m^{ed} \equiv m \pmod{N}$, then $m^{ed-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, hence r divides $ed - 1$ by properties of order.
  - Conversely, if d is such that $ed \equiv 1 \bmod r$, then $m^{ed} \equiv m \pmod{N}$, since $m^r \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$.
- In general, the expectation is that Eve would essentially need to factor N in order to compute a decryption exponent in a reasonable amount of time. Without knowledge of the exact value of $\varphi(N)$, there is no known way to construct such a d that also allows for efficient computation.
  - Furthermore, it can be shown that computing $\varphi(N)$ is equivalent to factoring N, if N is the product of two primes.
  - It can also be shown that the order of a unit modulo $N = pq$ divides $\text{lcm}(p-1, q-1)$, and that there are always units whose order is exactly equal to this value.
  - If $p-1$ and $q-1$ have many factors in common (e.g., if p and q were chosen poorly) then the order could be much smaller than N. On the other hand, if p and q are chosen carefully with $\gcd(p-1, q-1)$ small, then the lcm is quite large, meaning there is little hope for Eve to construct a d without knowledge of $\varphi(N)$.
- To summarize, it is strongly suspected (but not proven) that there does not exist any algorithm that can compute decryption exponents for RSA that is particularly more efficient than factoring the public key N.

3.3.2 Attacks on RSA

- There are a number of attacks on RSA, particularly if the encryption exponent is small. We will list a few of them at varying levels of effectiveness.
- Attack 1 (Brute force): If the number of possible plaintexts is small and Eve wants to know how a message decodes, she could simply encrypt all possible plaintexts and compare them to the ciphertext.
  - As in our earlier discussion, the same problem exists for any cryptosystem with a small number of possible plaintexts.
  - To avoid this issue, Bob simply needs to choose his value of N to be sufficiently large, and then to pad each message with a random string at the beginning (or end) of sufficient length that makes it infeasible for Eve to test all of the possibilities.
- Attack 2 (Factoring): If Eve wants to break Bob's RSA key, one method that would certainly work is factoring N.
  - Once Eve has a factorization of N, she can compute the decryption exponent the same way Bob does.

- In general, it is believed that factorization of large integers is difficult with a standard (i.e., non-quantum) computer, provided the primes in the factorization are sufficiently large and not of any particularly special form (e.g., not congruent to 1 modulo a large power of 2 and not such that $p-1$ has a large number of small divisors). We will describe some general-purpose and special-purpose factorization algorithms later.
- If some extra information about the prime divisors is known to Eve, then there are more efficient factorization procedures.
- For example, if we are trying to factor $N = pq$ where p and q are primes of approximately equal size, and the first half or the last half of the digits of p are known, then the factorization can be found using lattice reduction methods very quickly, in time polynomial in $\log_2 p$. For comparison, a brute-force attempt of all possible primes less than p whose digits agree with the known ones would take about $\sqrt{p}$ steps.

- We will remark that the current (publicly known) record for factorization of an RSA public key is 768 bits, which was done in 2010 and took approximately 2^{67} individual computations and a total computing time equivalent to roughly 2000 years on a single-core 2GHz desktop computer.
  - It is expected that an RSA key of length 1024 bits is probably factorable now in 2022, given sufficient computing power (e.g., on the order of a government agency). But 2048 bits seems very much out of reach with current technology. (2048 bits and 4096 bits are typical RSA key sizes for securing HTTPS connections in 2022.)
  - A direct factorization attack using a standard computer appears computationally infeasible for sufficiently large public keys. However, there exist much faster factorization algorithms, such as Shor's algorithm, that could be run on a quantum computer, assuming a sufficiently large one can ever be built.

- Attack 3 (Håstad's attack): Suppose the same message m is encrypted using the encryption exponent $e = 3$ each time and sent to 3 recipients using 3 different public keys N_1, N_2, and N_3, which are assumed to be relatively prime.
  - Note that if the public keys are not relatively prime, taking the gcd of two keys would immediately give a factorization of both, so we are not making that much of an assumption above.
  - Suppose Eve intercepts the three encoded messages c_1, c_2, and c_3.
  - Using the Chinese Remainder Theorem, Eve solves the three congruences $C \equiv c_1 \pmod{N_1}$, $C \equiv c_2 \pmod{N_2}$, and $C \equiv c_3 \pmod{N_3}$, to obtain a residue class C modulo $N_1N_2N_3$, with $C \equiv m^3 \pmod{N_1N_2N_3}$.
  - But now, since $0 \le m < N_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, it is the case that $0 \le m^3 < N_1N_2N_3$. Since C also lies in this range and is congruent to m^3, in fact $C = m^3$ (as an integer).
  - But now Eve can compute the plaintext m by finding the cube root of C over the integers (which is easy to do numerically).

- Håstad's attack is one of the reasons it can be a poor idea to use a small encryption exponent.
  - In general, performing Håstad's attack with an encryption exponent of e requires e different encodings of the message with different public keys.
  - Identical encodings of the same message with different public keys could happen in a variety of settings. A natural one would be a mass email that is sent to many different addresses: if each copy of the message is sent to a different recipient using RSA, then an eavesdropper could obtain tens, hundreds, or even thousands of encodings of the message with different public keys (certainly enough to decode the message unless the value of e is extremely large). In practice, email is not usually encoded with asymmetric encryption, but the principle still holds.

- Although RSA is comparatively fast, it is still much slower than modern symmetric cryptosystems. As such, a typical use of RSA is to send a key for a symmetric cryptosystem which is then used to encode future messages. However, if some care is not taken when encoding the message, this procedure can be attacked.

- Attack 4 (Short plaintext attack): Suppose it is 1983 and Alice wants to send Bob a 56-bit key for DES, of which there are about 2^{56} possibilities. Alice simply encodes the message as a 56-bit integer and sends it to Bob using Bob's 200-digit RSA key.

- A direct brute-force attack is not feasible for Eve to perform because 2^{56} is a fairly large computation even by modern standards. (Remember that it is 1983 in this example.)
- Eve instead gambles that the key Alice encoded was a composite number with prime factors that were not unreasonably large, say $m = ab$ for some integers a, b with $a, b \le 2^{30}$. This is reasonably likely to occur in practice.
- Eve then computes a list of the values of x^e (mod N) for all $1 \le x \le 2^{30}$ and all values cy^{-e} (mod N) for all $1 \le y \le 2^{30}$.
- If Eve finds an element common to both lists with then she knows $x^e \equiv c\,y^{-e}$ (mod N) so that $(xy)^e \equiv c$ (mod N). Raising to the dth power gives $xy \equiv c^d \equiv m$ (mod N), so Eve can compute m since she knows x and y.
- This attack is much more efficient because Eve only needs to store two lists of 2^{30} elements each (only a few terabytes) and compare them to each other.
- This attack is easy to defeat using a padding procedure: if Alice instead tells Bob ahead of time that she will be including 100 random digits before and after her 56-bit key, Bob can simply delete them once he decodes the message, but Eve's attack will no longer work since the message m is not likely to have a factorization into small terms.

- <u>Attack 5</u> (Low decryption exponent): If the decryption exponent d is sufficiently small relative to $N = pq$ and the primes p and q are reasonably close together, it is possible to compute d very rapidly using continued fractions.
  - Specifically, if $q < p < 2q$ and if $d < \frac{1}{3}N^{1/4}$, then d can be computed rapidly.
  - First, observe that $N - \varphi(N) = p + q - 1 < 3\sqrt{N}$ by the assumptions on p and q.
  - Now if $de = 1+k\varphi(N)$, since $d < \frac{1}{3}N^{1/4}$ and $e < \varphi(N)$ we see $\varphi(N)k < de < \frac{1}{3}\varphi(N) \cdot N^{1/4}$ so $k < \frac{1}{3}N^{1/4}$.
  - Then $0 < \frac{k}{d} - \frac{e}{N} = \frac{kn - ed}{dN} = \frac{k(n - \varphi(N))}{dN} < \frac{1/3 \cdot N^{1/4} \cdot 3\sqrt{N}}{dN} = \frac{n^{3/4}}{dN} < \frac{1}{3d^2}$.
  - So what this means is that $\left|\frac{e}{N} - \frac{k}{d}\right| < \frac{1}{3d^2}$. Recall that we are trying to compute d: what this says is that the rational number k/d is very close to e/N.
  - From the theory of continued fractions, it is known that for any real number α, if $\left|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}\right| < \frac{1}{2q^2}$ then p/q is one of the convergents to the continued fraction expansion of α. (We will not actually discuss the details of computing continued fractions since it would take us too far afield, but suffice it to say that they are easy to compute.)
  - Since k/d lies within the required bound, it must be one of the convergents to the continued fraction of e/N. Eve can compute the convergents very rapidly, and then test whether each pair (k, d) gives an integer solution to $de = 1 + k\varphi(N)$ for $\varphi(N)$.
  - When she obtains an integer solution for $\varphi(N)$, she can then compute the factorization of N since she has both N and $\varphi(N)$.

- <u>Attack 6</u> (Partially-known plaintext, low exponent): If a portion of a plaintext is known and the encryption exponent is low, it can be possible to decode the remaining piece of the ciphertext.
  - An example where this kind of situation can occur is when interacting with automated scripts: when resetting a password over a secure channel, the response message is likely to be something of the form "Thank you for changing your password. As confirmation, your new password is ———" (where the dashes indicate the user's password).
  - We will illustrate the basic ideas in the case where $e = 3$. If the beginning of the plaintext is known, then the message m has the form $m = A + x$ where A is a known large number and x is an unknown small number.
  - The ciphertext is then $c \equiv (A + x)^3 = x^3 + 3Ax^2 + 3Ax + A^3$ (mod N).

- Eve therefore wants to find a small solution x to the polynomial congruence $x^3+3Ax^2+3A^2x+(A^3-c) \equiv 0 \pmod{N}$.
- Eve can apply a lattice reduction algorithm such as LLL to some well-chosen vectors to find a small solution to the modular congruence, and then solve the resulting polynomial over the real numbers to determine the value of x.
- When N is sufficiently large relative to x, this procedure will be much faster than any kind of brute-force attack using the known plaintext information.

- Attack 7 (Timing attack): Depending on the algorithms that are used, it is possible to determine information about the decryption exponent by measuring how long it takes to perform each step of the computation.
  - Such attacks have nothing to do with the RSA cryptosystem itself, but rather the potentially insecure ways in which the algorithm is implemented by a computer.
  - Here is the rough idea behind a timing attack: most implementations on binary computers use "power chain" squaring to do modular exponentiation, since this requires much less memory than the direct successive squaring procedure we described.
  - When doing power-chain squaring, when there is a bit 1 in the exponent the computer must do a multiplication before squaring, and when there is a bit 0 the computer only needs to square.
  - If, for example, each multiplication and each squaring took 1 nanosecond, and the computer required 20 nanoseconds to decrypt a message whose decryption exponent has 16 bits, then there were 16 squarings (because of the size of the decryption exponent) and thus 4 multiplications.
  - This would tell us that the decryption exponent had exactly 4 ones in its binary representation.
  - Of course in practice, there is substantial variation in hardware and software computing speeds, but taking an average over a sufficiently large sample would give a fairly good estimate of the number of multiplications.
  - To extract additional information about the positioning of the ones in the binary representation, we can study the variation in the computing speed.
  - Explicitly: if a particular bit in the decryption exponent is equal to 0, then the amount of time it takes to do a single multiplication at that stage will be independent of the amount of time the remaining computation takes (since the computation does not require a multiplication there). But if the bit is equal to 1, the time it takes to do a single multiplication will not be independent (since that multiplication is part of the computation).
  - It is possible to determine whether two random variables are correlated or uncorrelated using basic statistical analysis (e.g., by plotting the values for many observations and computing a regression coefficient): by doing this, Eve can determine whether each successive bit in the decryption exponent was 0 or 1.
  - A variation on this attack is instead to measure the power consumption of the computer: it will use more power when it is doing a computation than when it is not, so one can glean information about what is occurring during the different steps of the computation by recording the processor's power usage.

- This kind of timing / power measurement attack is hard to guard against for reasons that are deeply ingrained in modern computer architecture.
  - One way to try to prevent timing attacks is to intentionally mask the speed of the calculations by making the computer evaluate a multiplication at every stage (even though the result is not actually used half the time). Then each step will take essentially the same amount of time no matter what the bits of the decryption exponent are, so there is no information leaked by measuring how long the computations take.
  - However, most software compilers are specifically designed to streamline program code when converting it to machine language, and they will do things like removing computations that are not used at any subsequent time. From a programming perspective this is an extremely helpful thing for a compiler to do, since any unused branches of code are simply a drag on the computer: removing them from the machine code will speed up the computation.
  - But of course, in the case where we intentionally add an unused calculation to prevent a timing attack, the compiler's attempts to be helpful will make the implementation vulnerable again!

- Even when we can arrange matters so that the compiler does not add a vulnerability (which is for obvious reasons a difficult computational problem), the computer processor itself might create one.
- Most (perhaps all) computer processors use a "branch predictor" to try to guess whether a particular branch will be taken in a program will be taken before it actually occurs. The goal is to improve the speed of the program by partially executing the branch that the computer predicts will be taken: if the prediction is correct, the processor has effectively saved time by evaluating a later part of the code already, but if the prediction is wrong, the processor will have to back up and use the correct branch.
- By analyzing the performance of a branch predictor in an appropriately devious way, it is essentially possible to reproduce a timing attack even when the power-chain squaring algorithm is modified to have essentially the same computations regardless of the bits in the decryption exponent.
- There are ways to code the successive squaring algorithm in such a way to avoid this kind of attack, but (at the least) it is not clear whether other implementations might not be vulnerable to other kinds of attacks.

3.4 Zero-Knowledge Proofs

- One major obstacle to key exchange is the lack of authentication of the participants. We would like to construct an identity-verification system wherein one participant can prove their identity to the other.
  - The two participants in such an identity-verification system are traditionally named Peggy (for "prover") and Victor (for "verifier").
- Peggy would like to have a way of proving her identity to Victor in a way that does not allow anyone else to impersonate her using the information. This is the fundamental idea of a zero-knowledge proof[2], which we can explain with an informal example:
  - Peggy claims to have the amazing ability to count the number of leaves on any tree she sees, instantly.
  - Victor does not believe that Peggy has this ability, so he challenges her by pointing to a tree and asking her to count the number of leaves.
  - Peggy responds "That tree has exactly 66,712 leaves".
  - Of course, it would be completely infeasible for Victor to count the leaves himself to verify that Peggy was telling the truth.
  - It might seem that Victor has no other way to test Peggy's ability, but eventually, they develop the following protocol:
    1. Peggy first looks at the tree (and counts the current number of leaves), and then looks away.
    2. Victor then either removes one leaf from the tree, or two leaves.
    3. Peggy then looks back at the tree and tells Victor whether he removed one leaf or two leaves.
  - Victor and Peggy then repeat this protocol many times. If Peggy really does have the amazing ability she claims, then she can always pass the test because she can always tell how many leaves Victor removed.
  - If she doesn't have the ability, then she only has a 50-50 chance of guessing right each time. So if they perform the test many times, it will be very unlikely that Peggy can pass every time.
- We now give an example of a zero-knowledge proof system modeled on the Rabin cryptosystem:
  - Peggy chooses two large primes p and q and publishes $N = pq$. She also chooses a secret s, computes $s^2 \pmod N$, and publishes this value. These two values serve as her identity.
  - Victor wants Peggy to prove that she knows the secret value s. They do this according to the following protocol:
    1. Peggy chooses a random unit u modulo N, and sends Victor the value of $u^2 \pmod N$.
    2. Victor then chooses to ask for u or su at random.

[2]The idea of a zero-knowledge proof was originally promulgated in a paper by Goldwasser, Micali, and Rackoff in 1985. (The paper was actually written in 1982 but was rejected from major conferences several times before finally appearing.)

3. Peggy sends Victor the quantity he requested.
4. If Victor asked for u, he squares the value and compares it to the value $u^2 \pmod N$ which Peggy sent earlier. If Victor asked for su, he squares the value and compares it to $s^2 \cdot u^2 \pmod N$, which he can also compute. If the appropriate value agrees, Peggy passes.

◦ The challenges are repeated until Victor is satisfied that Peggy does indeed know the secret s.

• Example: Peggy chooses $N = 564481$ and $s = 53402$, and publishes the value of N along with the value $15592 \equiv s^2 \pmod N$. We analyze some possible scenarios:

1. Victor challenges Peggy to prove she knows s.
   - Peggy first chooses $u = 364210$ and sends Victor the message "404948", which is $u^2 \pmod N$.
   - Victor then flips a coin and sends Peggy the message "Send me su".
   - Peggy responds with the message "349565", which is $su \pmod N$.
   - Victor then checks whether $(su)^2 = 349565^2$ agrees with the values $s^2 \cdot u^2 = 15592 \cdot 404948$ that Victor already has. He indeed sees that $349565^2 \equiv 229231 \pmod N$, and $15592 \cdot 404948 \equiv 229231 \pmod{77}$ as well, so Peggy passes the first test.
   - Victor and Peggy then repeat the challenge 100 more times, and Peggy passes each time.
2. Eve attempts to impersonate Peggy. Victor challenges Eve to prove she knows s.
   - Eve knows $n = 564481$ and $s^2 \equiv 15592 \pmod N$, since these were published by Peggy, but Eve does not actually know s.
   - Eve guesses that Victor is going to ask for su. She chooses a random $x = 412009$, and then sends Victor the message "403457", which is equal to $x^2 \cdot (s^2)^{-1} \bmod N$. (She computes the inverse of s^2 using the Euclidean algorithm.)
   - Victor then flips a coin and sends Eve the message "Send me su".
   - Eve made her choice in such a way that she could respond to Victor's challenge if he asked for su: she responds with her value of x: "412009".
   - Victor verifies that $(su)^2 = 412009^2 \equiv 15592 \cdot 403457 = s^2 \cdot u^2$ modulo N. Eve passes this round.
3. Victor challenges Eve again.
   - This time, Eve guesses that Victor is going to ask for u.
   - She chooses a random unit $u = 116533$, and sends Victor the message "220672", which is $u^2 \pmod N$.
   - Victor then flips a coin and sends Eve the message "Send me su".
   - This time, Eve cannot respond to the challenge: she knows u (and could have responded to Victor's challenge if he had asked for u) but she does not know su, because she does not know s.
   - Thus, Eve fails the challenge, and now Victor knows she is an imposter.

• In order to verify that this protocol is a zero-knowledge proof, we must check three things.

1. The test must be complete: Peggy can always pass the test.
   - This is obvious, because Peggy knows both u and s.
2. The test must be sound: if Eve does not actually know the value of s, then she cannot always pass the test.
   - In order to pass the test, Eve needs to be able to compute square roots of both $(su)^2$ and u^2 modulo n. But if she can do this, she can easily compute s, so this is equivalent to knowing s.
   - If Eve does not know s, then she can provide at most one of the two values u, su when challenged by Victor, so she has at most a $1/2$ probability of passing the test in this case.
3. The test must be zero-knowledge: Eve does not acquire any information about the secret s by observing real conversations between Peggy and Victor.
   - It is sufficient to show that Eve can simulate conversations with the same distribution as valid conversations between Peggy and Victor. If she can do this, then she gains no information by monitoring the actual conversations, because they are indistinguishable from fake conversations.

    - Eve simulates a challenge in the following way: first, she randomly decides whether "Victor" will ask for u or su.
    - In the first case, she has "Peggy" send the initial message $x^2 \pmod N$, where she chooses x at random: then the response from "Peggy" to "Victor's" challenge for a square root of x^2 is simply x (which Eve knows).
    - In the second case, she has "Peggy" send the initial message $x^2 s^{-2} \pmod N$, where she again chooses x at random: then the response from "Peggy" to "Victor's" challenge for a square root of $s^2(x^2 s^{-2})$ is just x again (which Eve knows).
    - In either case, this simulated conversation between "Peggy" and "Victor" is valid.
    - But now since Eve chose Victor's choice of u or su, along with the value of x randomly, the distribution of outcomes is the same as that of a real conversation.

- We will note that the strength of this identity-verification system depends on the difficulty of computing square roots modulo N, which is the same underlying problem that the Rabin encryption algorithm relies on, and which we proved was equivalent to factoring N.

- It is also very important to note that the above system is not a "proof of identity" in the way the term is colloquially used. The only information that is obtained, by anyone, following the zero-knowledge proof protocol is: Victor is now confident that the person he is communicating with knows the secret number s.

- This zero-knowledge proof system is easily adapted to create an authentication protocol using Rabin encryption. (For simplicity we will ignore the issues of nonuniqueness of square roots, but they can be dealt with.)
    - Alice creates a public key N_a as in Rabin encryption, and Bob creates his own public key N_b. Alice and Bob need to be confident that these public keys were actually created by one another (which they could do, for example, by creating the keys in each other's presence), and that nobody else can factor their keys.
    - Bob then wants to send Alice an encoded message m and makes her prove she can decode it, without revealing any other information. Bob follows Rabin encryption and sends Alice the value of m^2 modulo N_a.
    - He and Alice then perform the zero-knowledge protocol described above to prove that Alice actually knows the secret value m (which she does, because she knows how to factor N_a and hence can compute the square root of m^2).
    - Now Bob knows that his message reached someone who successfully decoded it, which (by assumption) can only be Alice.
    - The procedure works in the other direction as well: Alice can send Bob an encrypted message and verify that it was decoded correctly by Bob.
    - Alice and Bob can now continue sending messages to one another using their separate public keys (performing a zero-knowledge proof with each message), to be secure in the knowledge that the other party has received and decoded them.

- Now suppose Mallory is recording all of the conversations, or even attempting to impersonate Alice or Bob.
    - Whatever Mallory does, there is no way to interfere with the authentication procedure in either direction, because any change to any of the messages will cause the zero-knowledge proof to fail.
    - Mallory also cannot decrypt any of the encrypted messages, since that is equivalent to breaking Rabin encryption (which is assumed to be difficult).
    - At worst, Mallory could simply prevent messages from passing between Alice and Bob at all, but that is always possible over any communication channel.

- One of the drawbacks of the basic Rabin zero-knowledge protocol is that it requires many rounds of communication between Peggy and Victor. This is not really an issue since it is very easy to parallelize the challenge rounds to do them all simultaneously, but introduces the extra cost of making the messages correspondingly longer.

- Explicitly, to begin Peggy generates 100 different values $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{100}$ and send all of their squares to Victor in a single message.
- Victor then flips 100 coins and responds with the results, which indicate to Peggy which of u_i or su_i he wants.
- Peggy then responds to the 100 challenges with the 100 corresponding values, and finally Victor checks all of the results. If they are all correct, then he believes Peggy knows the secret s, and if any of them is incorrect he rejects her claim. (Perhaps even to account for the occasional transmission error, Victor could decide only to reject if Peggy fails 5 or more of the 100 challenges.)

3.5 Primality and Compositeness Testing

- In order to implement the public-key cryptosystems we have discussed, we need a way to generate large prime numbers.
- It might seem that finding large prime numbers would be very difficult, but it is actually relatively simple.
  - The Prime Number Theorem says that the approximate number of primes less than X is $\dfrac{X}{\ln X}$.
  - Therefore (roughly) the probability that a randomly-chosen large integer N is prime is about $\dfrac{1}{\ln N}$.
  - So for example, if we choose a random integer with 100 digits (in base 10), it has an approximately $\dfrac{1}{\ln(10^{100})} \approx 0.4\%$ chance of being prime.
  - However, this probability includes the possibility that we chose N to be even, or divisible by 3, or 5, or 7, and so forth. If we throw away integers divisible by primes less than 20, the probability of picking a prime randomly increases to about 2.5%.
  - We would like to develop efficient methods for testing whether a given large integer is prime: if we can, then it should be relatively straightforward to find large primes by choosing essentially random numbers until we get one that passes all the tests.
  - For example, if we take 200 randomly chosen 100-digit integers with no divisors less than 20 (it is easy to screen out integers with small divisors), the probability that at least one of them is actually prime is about $1 - 0.975^{200} \approx 99.4\%$, which is extremely high!
- Thus, the only remaining ingredient for generating big primes is a method for determining whether a given large integer n is prime or composite, without needing to factor it in the event that it is composite.
- There are various naive methods for doing this (such as attempting to divide n by each prime smaller than $\sqrt{n}$ to see if it divides evenly), but these are extremely impractical if n has hundreds of digits. Our goal is to describe several effective primality testing methods that are motivated by the results we have already proven.
- We will note that there are a wide variety of primality/compositeness tests and factorization algorithms of varying complexity, many of which we do not possess the background to discuss. Therefore, we will cover only a few of the most approachable techniques.

3.5.1 The Fermat Compositeness Test

- Fermat's Little Theorem says that if p is prime, then $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$ for every a. By taking the contrapositive, we obtain a sufficient condition for an integer to be composite.
- Test (Fermat Test): If a is an integer such that $a^n \not\equiv a \pmod{n}$, then n is composite.
  - Remark: The Fermat test is not a primality test: it is a compositeness test. There are only two possible outcomes of the test: either it shows that n is composite, or it yields no result. In particular, it can never be used to say that an integer is actually prime.
- Example: Apply the Fermat test to determine whether $n = 56\,011\,607$ is composite.

- Using successive squaring, we can compute $2^{56\,011\,607} \equiv 48\,437\,830 \pmod{n}$: therefore, n is $\boxed{\text{composite}}$.
- Note that the test does not tell us anything about the factorization of n: we know is that n is composite, but we don't have any information about the factorization.
- In fact, one may check that n is the product of the two primes 6653 and 8419.

- It would be quite pleasant if the Fermat test were successful for every composite number. Unfortunately, this is not the case, as it is possible to make a bad choice for a.

- Example: Apply the Fermat test to decide whether $n = 341$ is composite.
  - Using successive squaring, we can compute that $2^{341} \equiv 2 \pmod{341}$, so the test provides no information with $a = 2$.
  - We instead try $a = 3$: successive squaring yields $3^{341} \equiv 168 \pmod{341}$, whence we see that 341 is composite.

- We might still hope that there will always be some a for which the Fermat test succeeds. Unfortunately, this is not the case either: there exist integers with the property that the Fermat test fails for *every* residue class a.

- Example: Show that the Fermat test fails, for every a, to recognize $561 = 3 \cdot 11 \cdot 17$ as composite.
  - To see this, first note that by the Chinese Remainder Theorem, it is enough to see that $a^{561} \equiv a$ modulo 3, 11, and 17 for every a.
  - Fermat's Little Theorem implies that $a^3 \equiv a \pmod{3}$. Multiplying both sides by a^2 gives $a^5 \equiv a^3 \equiv a$. Iterating, we see more generally that $a^{2k+1} \equiv a \pmod{3}$ for any k. In particular, taking $k = 280$ yields $a^{561} \equiv a \pmod{3}$.
  - In the same way we see that $a^{10k+1} \equiv a \pmod{11}$ for every k, so in particular taking $k = 56$ gives $a^{561} \equiv a \pmod{11}$. Similarly, we have $a^{16k+1} \equiv a \pmod{17}$, so by taking $k = 35$ we see $a^{561} \equiv a \pmod{17}$.

- Definition: An integer m for which the Fermat test fails modulo m for every a is called a Carmichael number (or pseudoprime).
  - It has been shown that there are infinitely many Carmichael numbers, but that they are significantly less common than primes (in an appropriate sense).

- In practice, Fermat's test is fairly effective when performed for enough values of a. Nonetheless, because of the existence of Carmichael numbers, it has a positive probability of failing to identify a number as composite.

3.5.2 The Miller-Rabin Compositeness Test

- We would like to improve on the Fermat test, since it has a positive probability of failing to yield any results. To begin, suppose p is prime and consider the solutions to $r^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$.
  - This congruence is equivalent to $p | (r^2 - 1) = (r-1)(r+1)$, so since p is prime, the solutions are $r \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$.
  - Now, if m is an odd integer that is prime, and a is any nonzero residue class, Fermat's Little Theorem implies that for $r = a^{(m-1)/2}$, we have $r^2 = a^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$.
  - By the above, we can conclude that $a^{(m-1)/2} \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{m}$.
  - Furthermore, in the event that $r \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ and $m-1$ is divisible by 4, we see that for $s = a^{(m-1)/4}$, we have $s^2 = a^{(m-1)/2} = r \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$.
  - By the above logic applied again, we necessarily have $s = \pm 1 \pmod{m}$.
  - We can clearly repeat the above argument if $s \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ and $m-1$ is divisible by 8, and so on and so forth.

- Test (Miller-Rabin Test): Let m be an odd integer and write $m-1=2^k d$ for d odd. For a residue class a modulo m, calculate each of the values a^d, a^{2d}, a^{4d}, ... , $a^{2^k d}$ modulo m. If the last entry is $\not\equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ then m is composite. Furthermore, if any entry in the list is $\equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ and the previous entry is not $\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{m}$, then m is composite.
  - Proof: The first statement is simply the Fermat test. The second statement is an application of the contrapositive of the statement "$r^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ implies $r \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$" established above.
  - Remark: Like with the Fermat test, a single application of the Miller-Rabin test cannot prove affirmatively that a given number is prime: it can only show that m is composite.
- Example: Use the Miller-Rabin test to determine whether 561 is prime.
  - We will try $a=2$ with $m=561$. Observe $m-1=2^4\cdot 35$, so $k=4$ and $d=35$.
  - We need to compute a^{35}, a^{70}, a^{140}, a^{280}, a^{560} modulo 561.
  - We can do this rapidly by successive squaring: this yields the list 263, 166, 67, 1, 1.
  - Since the fourth term is 1 and the previous term is not $\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{561}$, we conclude that 561 is composite.
- Example: Use the Miller-Rabin test to determine whether 2047 is prime.
  - We try $a=2$ with $m=2047$. Observe $m-1=2\cdot 1023$, so $k=1$ and $d=1023$.
  - We need to compute a^{1023}, a^{2046} modulo 2047.
  - Successive squaring yields the values 1, 1: thus, the test is inconclusive for $a=2$.
  - Next we try $a=3$: successive squaring yields 1565, 1013. The last entry is not $\equiv 1$, so m is composite.
- The Miller-Rabin test is much stronger than the Fermat test, as can be seen from the example above: we showed earlier that 561 is a Carmichael number, meaning that the Fermat test will never show it is composite. On the other hand, the Miller-Rabin test succeeds in showing 561 is composite using only the residue $a=2$.
- Definition: If m is odd and composite, and the Miller-Rabin test fails for a modulo m, we say that m is a strong pseudoprime to the base a.
  - It turns out that strong pseudoprimes are fairly uncommon. For example, it has been proven that, for any odd composite m, the Miller-Rabin test succeeds for at least 75% of the residue classes modulo m.
  - In particular, there are no "Carmichael numbers" for the Miller-Rabin test, where the test fails for every residue class.
  - Furthermore, if an integer m passes the Miller-Rabin test for more than $m/4$ residue classes modulo m, then m is prime. This is not a computationally effective way to show that an integer is prime, since it requires $m/4$ calculations (far more than trial division).
  - However, it is believed that the bound can be substantially lowered from $m/4$. If we assume the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (which is typically believed to be true), then it has been proven that testing the first $2(\log m)^2$ residues modulo m is sufficient.
- In practice, the Miller-Rabin test is used "probabilistically": we apply the test many times to the integer m, and if it passes sufficiently many times, we say m is probably prime.
  - Any given residue has at least a 3/4 probability of showing that m is composite, so the probability that a composite integer m can pass the test k times with randomly-chosen residues a is at most $1/4^k$.
  - Taking $k=100$ gives a probability negligable enough to use for all practical purposes (since the probability of having a hardware or programming error is certainly higher than $1/4^{100}$).
  - The Miller-Rabin test is very fast: a single application of the test to an integer m requires approximately $(\log m)^2$ calculations (to perform the required modular exponentiations), so even for integers with hundreds or thousands of digits, the method will quickly return a result that is correct with extremely high probability.
  - As noted above, if we assume the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis then the Miller-Rabin test would give a proof of primality in roughly $2(\log m)^4$ steps.

3.5.3 The AKS Primality Test

- What we still lack is a provably fast algorithm that determines whether a given integer m is prime. A starting point is the following observation:
- Proposition: If a is relatively prime to m and x is variable, then $(x+a)^m \equiv x^m + a$ (modulo m) holds, as a polynomial congruence in x with coefficients modulo m, if and only if m is prime.
  - For example, if $a = 2$ and $m = 5$, the result says $(x+2)^5 = x^5 + 10x^4 + 40x^3 + 80x^2 + 80x + 32$ is equivalent (modulo 5) to the polynomial $x^5 + 2$, which is indeed the case.
  - Conversely, if $a = 1$ and $m = 4$, the result says $(x+1)^4 = x^4 + 4x^3 + 6x^2 + 4x + 1$ should not be equivalent (modulo 4) to the polynomial $x^4 + 1$, which it is not.
  - Proof: Expanding out the power with the binomial theorem shows that $(x+a)^m \equiv x^m + a$ (modulo m) is equivalent to saying that $\binom{m}{k}$ is divisible by m for all $0 < k < m$, and $a^m \equiv a \pmod{m}$.
  - If p is prime, then we can write $\binom{p}{k} = \dfrac{p!}{k! \cdot (p-k)!}$ and observe that the numerator is divisible by p but the denominator is not. Furthermore, Fermat's Little Theorem says $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$.
  - Now suppose m is not prime. We claim that one of the binomial coefficients $\binom{m}{k}$ with $0 < k < m$ is not divisible by m. Explicitly, if $m = p^r d$ where p is prime and d is not divisible by p, then $\binom{m}{p} = \dfrac{m(m-1)\cdots(m-p+1)}{p!}$ is not divisible by p^r, since the only term in the numerator divisible by p is $n = p^r$, but there is a factor of p in the denominator.
- Although this result is a primality test, it is not especially useful, since computing the necessary binomial coefficients takes quite a long time. One way to speed up the computation is to take both sides modulo the polynomial $x^r - 1$ for some small r: in other words, to check whether the relation $(x+a)^m \equiv x^m + a \pmod{x^r - 1}$ holds, where coefficients are also considered modulo m.
  - The difficulty is that we may lose information by doing this. It turns out that if we choose r carefully, and verify the congruence for enough different values of a, we can prove that it necessarily holds in general.
- Test (Agrawal-Kayal-Saxena Test): Let $m > 1$ be an odd integer that is not of the form a^b for any $b > 1$.
  - Let r be the smallest value such that the order of r modulo m is greater than $(\log m)^2$.
    - This value can be computed simply by finding the orders of 2, 3, ... , until one of them has an order exceeding this bound.
    - If any of these integers divides m, then m is clearly composite.
    - If there is no such residue less than m, m is prime. (This can only happen for $m < 10^7$.)
    - There will always be such an r satisfying $r \le 1 + (\log m)^5$.
  - For each a with $1 \le a \le \sqrt{\varphi(r)} \log m$, check whether $(x+a)^m \equiv x^m + a \pmod{x^r - 1, m}$.
    - If any of these congruences fails, m is composite.
    - Otherwise, m is prime.
- We will not prove the correctness of the AKS algorithm here.
  - However, we will note that the algorithm gives an affirmative declaration of whether m is prime or composite (unlike the previous tests we have discussed).
  - Furthermore, the runtime of this algorithm is a polynomial in $\log m$: it is much more efficient than (say) trial division, which has a runtime of roughly $\sqrt{m}$.
  - The version above runs in time roughly equal to $(\log m)^{12}$, and there have been subsequent modifications that lowered the time to approximately $(\log m)^6$. However, this is much slower than the "probabilistic" tests like the Miller-Rabin test, which is believed to run in time approximately $(\log m)^4$.

3.6 Factorization Algorithms

- All of the compositeness tests we have discussed so far are nonconstructive: they show that an integer m is composite without explicitly finding a divisor.
- We now turn to the question of actually factoring large integers. In general, factorization seems to be very much more computationally difficult than primality testing. We will describe some basic techniques.

3.6.1 The Fermat Factorization

- Suppose we wish to factor $n = pq$, where $p < q$ are odd numbers. (Usually they will be primes in the examples we consider, but this is not necessary.)
  - From the difference-of-squares identity, we write $n = \left(\frac{q+p}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{q-p}{2}\right)^2$.
  - If $q - p$ is small, then the term $\left(\frac{q-p}{2}\right)^2$ will be much smaller than $\left(\frac{q+p}{2}\right)^2$. This means that $\left(\frac{q+p}{2}\right)^2$ will be a perfect square that is only a small amount larger than n.
  - We can then simply compute the first integer $k \geq \sqrt{n}$ and then check whether any of the integers $k^2 - n$, $(k+1)^2 - n$, $(k+2)^2 - n$, ... ends up being a perfect square. If it is, the difference-of-squares identity yields a factorization.
  - Note that we can compute square roots to very high accuracy, extremely rapidly, using logarithms, since $\sqrt{n} = e^{\ln(n)/2}$.
- The method above is called the <u>Fermat factorization</u>: we search for a and b such that $n = a^2 - b^2 = (a+b)(a-b)$.
- <u>Example</u>: Factor $n = 1298639$.
  - We try looking for a Fermat factorization. We can compute numerically that $\sqrt{n} \approx 1139.58$.
  - We then compute $1140^2 - n = 961$, which is 31^2.
  - Hence we get the factorization $n = (1140 - 31) \cdot (1140 + 31) = 1109 \cdot 1171$. (Both of these integers turn out to be prime.)
- <u>Example</u>: Factor $n = 2789959$.
  - We try looking for a Fermat factorization. We compute $\sqrt{n} \approx 1670.32$.
  - We then compute $1671^2 - n = 2282$, which is not a square.
  - Next we try $1672^2 - n = 5625$, which is 75^2.
  - We obtain the factorization $n = (1672 - 75) \cdot (1672 + 75) = 1597 \cdot 1747$. (Both of these integers turn out to be prime.)
- Of course, the effectiveness of the Fermat factorization technique depends on how small $q - p$ is.
  - The number of iterations is more or less equal to $\sqrt{(q+p)/2} - \sqrt{n}$, which, if $q - p < n^{1/3}$, is bounded above by $2n^{1/6}$. Trial division takes roughly $\sqrt{n} = n^{1/2}$ iterations in the worst case, so the Fermat factorization is significantly faster than trial division if $q - p$ is small.
  - On the other hand, if q is roughly $2p$, then we would need to examine about p squares before we would find the factorization. In this case, $n \approx 2p^2$, so in terms of n we end up doing about $\sqrt{n}$ checks, which is the same as trial division.
- There are ways to modify the Fermat factorization that can overcome the issue of having q be larger than p.
  - For example, if it is known or suspected that $n = pq$ where q/p is close to 2, then applying the Fermat factorization technique to $8N$ will quickly return $8N = 4p \cdot 2q$, because $4p$ and $2q$ are very close together. (Multiplying by 8 is necessary because $2N = (p + q/2)^2 - (p - q/2)^2$ is not a difference of squares of integers.)
- Ultimately, however, the Fermat factorization is totally ineffective if p and q each have hundreds of digits: even if their first few digits are the same, searching for perfect squares will only be marginally faster than trial division.

3.6.2 Pollard's $p-1$ Algorithm

- One way to look for divisors of an integer n is as follows:
  - If a is a random residue modulo $n = pq$, then it is likely that the order of a modulo p is different from the order of a modulo q.
  - Suppose that the order of a modulo p is k, and is less than the order of a modulo q.
  - Then $a^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ while $a^k \not\equiv 1 \pmod{q}$, meaning that $\gcd(a^k - 1, n) = p$.
  - Of course, if $n = pq$ is a product of two primes, then it is likely that the order of a modulo p and modulo q is quite large, and so a direct search for the order would be very inefficient.
  - One way to speed the computation is to notice that we do not need to find the exact order of a: any multiple of it will suffice, as long as that multiple is not also divisible by the order of a modulo q.
  - A reasonably effective option that is also easy to implement is to evaluate the values $a^{1!}$, $a^{2!}$, $a^{3!}$, $a^{4!}$, ... , $a^{B!}$ modulo n (for some bound B), since the jth term is simply the jth power of the previous term. This procedure is guaranteed to return a result congruent to 1 modulo p provided that the order of a divides $B!$.

- Algorithm (Pollard's $(p-1)$-Algorithm): Suppose n is composite. Choose a bound B and a residue a modulo n. Set $x_1 = a$, and for $2 \le j \le B$, define $x_j = x_{j-1}^j \pmod{n}$. Compute $\gcd(x_B - 1, n)$: if the gcd is between 1 and n then we have found a divisor of n. If the gcd is 1 or n, start over with a new residue a.
  - If the gcd is 1, it may be possible to extend the computation to obtain a divisor by increasing the bound B. It is easy to resume such an aborted computation: we can simply compute additional terms x_j past x_B using the same recursion.
  - If the gcd is n, it may have been the case that B was chosen too large (i.e., we carried the computation sufficiently far that $B!$ was a multiple of the order modulo p and modulo q). In such a case, we could repeat the computation with a smaller bound (e.g., $B/2$) to see if stopping the calculation earlier would catch one of the orders modulo p or modulo q but not the other.
  - The idea behind the algorithm is if p is a prime divisor of n such that $p-1$ has only small prime factors, then the order of any element modulo p will divide $B!$ where B is comparatively small. On the other hand, if the other prime factors q_i of n are such that $q_i - 1$ has a large prime factor, it is unlikely that a randomly chosen residue will have small order modulo q.
  - Thus, when we apply Pollard's $(p-1)$-algorithm to a composite integer $n = pq$ where $p-1$ has only small prime divisors, it is likely that the procedure will quickly find the factorization. (This is the reason for the algorithm's name.)
  - It is a nontrivial problem in analytic number theory to determine the optimal choice for the bound B. In practice, for integers with 20 digits or fewer, one usually chooses B on the order of 10^5 or so: such a computation can be done essentially instantaneously by a computer.

- Example: Use Pollard's $(p-1)$-algorithm with $a = 2$ to find a divisor of $n = 4913429$.
  - We start with $a = 2$, so that $x_1 = 2$. For emphasis we will compute $\gcd(x_j - 1, n)$ for each value of j until we find a gcd larger than 1:

Value	$j=1$	$j=2$	$j=3$	$j=4$	$j=5$	$j=6$	$j=7$
x_j	2	4	64	2036929	251970	3059995	1426887
$\gcd(x_j - 1, n)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	2521

  - After the 7th step, we obtain a nontrivial divisor 2521, giving the factorization $n = \boxed{2521 \cdot 1949}$.
  - Observe that $2521 - 1 = 2520 = 2^3 3^2 5^1 7^1$ has only small divisors, and indeed 2520 divides 7! (so we were guaranteed to obtain it by the 7th iteration of the procedure).
  - On the other hand, $1949 - 1 = 2^2 \cdot 481$ has a large prime divisor, so it would usually take $B = 481$ to find 1949 as a divisor.

- We will remark that the speed of Pollard's $(p-1)$-algorithm depends on the size of the largest prime divisor of $p-1$, which can vary quite substantially even for primes p of approximately the same size.

- If p is an odd prime, then $p-1$ is clearly even, so the "worst case scenario" for Pollard's $(p-1)$-algorithm is to have $n = pq$ where $p = 2p_0 + 1$ and $q = 2q_0 + 1$ with p, q, p_0, q_0 all prime and where p and q are roughly equal. In such a case, we would require $B \approx p_0 \approx \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{n}$ in order to find the factorization (unless we are lucky with our choice of a).
- As an aside, a prime p_0 such that $2p_0 + 1$ is also prime is called a Germain prime. It is not known whether there are infinitely many such primes, although heuristically it is expected there should be infinitely many.
- It is also a rather involved analytic number theory problem to estimate the "expected" running time for the algorithm. In general, if we use a bound $B = n^{\alpha/2}$, then we would expect to have a probability roughly $\alpha^{-\alpha}$ of finding a factorization. When $\alpha = 1/2$ this says we would have about a 25% chance of obtaining a factorization if we take $B = n^{1/4}$.
- When generating an RSA modulus, it is very unlikely to choose a prime p such that $p-1$ only has small divisors by accident (at least, as long as one is choosing them randomly). Nevertheless, it is often a good idea to generate the modulus in such a way that each prime p has another large prime divisor of $p-1$.
- If, for example, one wants to generate a 250-digit prime p such that $p-1$ has a large prime divisor, one could first generate a 200-digit prime p_0 and a random 50-digit number k, and then test the numbers $p = (k+r)p_0 + 1$ for integers $r \geq 0$ until a prime is found. By construction, $p-1$ will then have the 200-digit prime p_0 as a divisor.

3.6.3 Pollard's ρ-Algorithm

- Another way we can try to generate divisors is in the following way: if we choose k integers modulo $n = pq$ at random, where $k > 2\sqrt{p}$, then it is likely that two of the k integers will be congruent modulo p, but different modulo n.
  - The reason for this is as follows: if we choose k integers modulo p, then the probability that they all lie in different residue classes is $\binom{p}{k}/p^k = \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \cdots \cdot \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{p}\right)$.
  - Taking the natural logarithm of this expression yields $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \log\left(1 - \frac{j-1}{p}\right) < -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{j-1}{p} < -\frac{k^2}{2p}$, where we invoked the inequality $\log(1-x) < -x$, which is true for small positive x.
  - Thus, the probability that two of the k integers lie in the same residue class modulo p is at least $1 - e^{-k^2/(2p)}$: so in particular, if $k = 2\sqrt{p}$, the probability will be roughly $1 - e^{-2} \approx 0.86$.
  - A typical application of this result in basic probability is to set $p = 365$ and $k = 23$, which yields the often-surprising result that if 23 people are chosen at random, the probability that two or more of them share a common birthday exceeds $1/2$.
- Choosing k random residue classes and testing whether any of them are congruent modulo p is not much faster than trial division, since $\binom{k}{2} \approx \frac{1}{2}k^2$ comparisons are needed in order to find two that are equal mod p, and if $k \approx 2\sqrt{p}$ then we do not obtain an improvement over trial division (which would also take p attempts).
- The observation, initially made by Pollard, is that we can speed up this process by generating the residue classes by iterating a polynomial map in the following way:
  - Let $p(x)$ be a polynomial with integer coefficients, and choose an arbitrary a, and consider the values a, $a_1 = p(a)$, $a_2 = p(p(a))$, $a_3 = p(p(p(a)))$, ..., taken modulo n, where in general we set $a_i = p(a_{i-1})$.
  - Absent any reason to expect otherwise, we would guess that the values $p(a_i)$ mod n will be essentially random, and so if we compare roughly $\sqrt{p}$ of them to each other, we are likely to find two that are congruent modulo p, if p is the smallest prime divisor of n.
  - The advantage lies in the fact that if $a_i \equiv a_j \pmod{p}$ for some $i < j$, then $a_{i+1} \equiv a_{j+1} \pmod{p}$, in turn implying $a_{i+2} \equiv a_{j+2} \pmod{p}$ and so forth. So the sequence becomes periodic with period $j - i$.
  - In particular, if $t \geq i$ is any multiple of the period $j - i$, then $a_t \equiv a_{2t} \pmod{p}$. This means we can detect the periodicity of this sequence by looking only at pairs of the form (a_t, a_{2t}), which is a vast improvement over having to search all pairs (a_i, a_j).

- To obtain a divisor of n, we therefore want to compute $\gcd(a_{2t} - a_t, n)$.

- Collecting the above observations yields the following algorithm:

- Algorithm (Pollard's ρ-Algorithm): Suppose n is composite and set $p(x) = x^2 + 1$. Choose an arbitrary a, set $x_0 = y_0 = a$, and then define $x_i = p(x_{i-1})$ mod n and $y_i = p(p(y_{i-1}))$ mod n. Compute $\gcd(y_i - x_i, n)$ for each i until the gcd exceeds 1. If the gcd is n, repeat the procedure with a different u_0 or a different polynomial $p(x)$.
  - Note that $y_i = x_{2i}$, so we could just have computed the sequence x_i and $\gcd(x_{2i} - x_i, n)$ for each i.
  - However, we organize the algorithm in this way because it only requires a fixed amount of storage space: we only need to keep track of the most recent pair (x_i, y_i) to compute the next one.
  - If we kept track of the x_i only, we would need to use more memory: at the step where we compute $\gcd(x_{2i} - x_i, n)$, we would need to keep the values x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, ... , x_{2i-1} for use later on. As i increases, so does the number of terms we need to keep track of.
  - There is also no particularly compelling reason to choose $p(x) = x^2 + 1$ aside from the fact that it seems to work well in practice. (Linear functions do not work, and more complicated polynomials would take longer to compute.)

- Example: Use Pollard's ρ-algorithm to find a divisor of $n = 1242301$.
  - We start with $u = 1$, so that $x_1 = 2$ and $y_1 = 5$ and then tabulate x_i and y_i mod n.

Value	$i=1$	$i=2$	$i=3$	$i=4$	$i=5$	$i=6$	$i=7$	$i=8$	$i=9$	$i=10$
x_i	2	5	26	677	458330	743607	710748	894671	544825	121987
y_i	5	677	743607	894671	121987	636498	581703	1109702	1195126	635655
$\gcd(y_i - x_i, n)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	281

  - We see that at the 10th step, we obtain a nontrivial divisor 281, yielding the factorization $n = 281 \cdot 4421$.

- We will remark that Pollard's ρ-algorithm is not guaranteed to find a divisor on any given attempt: rather, it is only expected to do so according to some heuristics.
  - However, we would expect that it should find the smallest prime divisor of n after roughly $\sqrt{p}$ steps, and since $p \le \sqrt{n}$, the expected runtime is on the order of $n^{1/4}$.
  - This is significantly faster than the $n^{1/2}$ we obtain from trial division, but it is still enormously large if n has hundreds of digits. On the other hand, it is more of a guarantee than in Pollard's $(p-1)$-algorithm, which can be very fast, but can also take nearly up to $n^{1/2}$ steps in the worst-case scenario.

3.6.4 Sieving Methods

- We can improve on the Fermat factorization method by using the following fact from modular arithmetic, which already essentially came up when we discussed Rabin encryption:

- Proposition: If n is composite and $a^2 \equiv b^2 \pmod{n}$ with $a \not\equiv \pm b \pmod{n}$, then $1 < \gcd(a + b, n) < n$.
  - Note that $a^2 \equiv b^2$ with $a \not\equiv \pm b$ can only happen if n is composite, since there are only at most two solutions to any quadratic equation modulo a prime.
  - Proof: The given hypotheses imply $n | (a + b)(a - b)$ and that n does not divide either factor.
  - Hence the gcd of $a + b$ and n cannot be 1 (since then necessarily n would divide $a - b$), and it cannot be n (since then necessarily n would divide $a + b$). Hence the gcd must be strictly between 1 and n.

- The point of this proposition is that, since we can compute the gcd rapidly using the Euclidean algorithm, having such an a and b immediately yields a divisor of n.
  - Example: Since $10^2 \equiv 3^2 \pmod{91}$, we can find a divisor of 91 by computing $\gcd(10 + 3, 91) = 13$. Indeed, 13 is a divisor of 91, with quotient 7.

- The task is then to find a more efficient way to construct such an a and b than brute-force searching.
  - Note that the goal of the Fermat factorization method is to construct a and b such that $n = a^2 - b^2$, which is a special case of what we are looking for.
  - It is possible to find such a and b when using the Miller-Rabin test: if the test successfully shows m is composite by finding $c^{2j} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ with $c^j \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{m}$, then $(c^j)^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ while $c^j \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{m}$: then $a = c^j$ and $b = 1$ satisfy the desired conditions.

- The method known as the quadratic sieve is one of the fastest procedures for factoring numbers less than 90 digits. Here is an outline of the procedure; the procedure we describe is properly called Dixon's factorization method, of which the quadratic sieve is an optimization:
  - Instead of trying to find a single value of a for which a^2 modulo n is a square, we instead compute a number of different values of a such that a^2 modulo n has all of its prime divisors in a small fixed set. Then, by taking products of some of these values, one can obtain a congruence of the form $a^2 \equiv b^2 \pmod{n}$ with $a \not\equiv \pm b \pmod{n}$.
  - For example, modulo 2077, if we search for powers that have small prime divisors we will find $46^2 \equiv 3^1 13^1$ and $59^2 \equiv 2^2 3^3 13^1$. Multiplying them yields the equality $(46 \cdot 59)^2 \equiv (2^1 3^2 13^1)^2$, which is the same as $637^2 \equiv 234^2$. Then $\gcd(637 - 234, 2077) = 31$, which gives a divisor of 2077.
  - In general, this kind of search requires (i) finding many squares whose factorizations only involve small primes, and then (ii) finding a product of such factorizations that has a square value.
  - Goal (i) is in general rather difficult, and we will not describe in detail the methods used to do it.
  - Goal (ii), however, can be done efficiently with linear algebra: the idea is to find a nonzero linear dependence between the vectors of prime-factorization exponents, considered modulo 2.
  - For example, if we want to find a set of elements among 6, 10, 30, 150 whose product is a perfect square, we first find the prime factorizations $6 = 2^1 3^1 5^0$, $10 = 2^1 3^0 5^1$, $30 = 2^1 3^1 5^1$, $150 = 2^1 3^1 5^2$. Then we take the four vectors of exponents $\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle$, $\langle 1, 0, 1 \rangle$, $\langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle$, $\langle 1, 1, 2 \rangle$ and search for a linear combination of these vectors whose entries are all even.
  - In this case, we can see that $\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle + \langle 1, 1, 2 \rangle = \langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle$, corresponding to the product $6 \cdot 150 = 900 = 30^2$.
  - There are simple linear-algebra procedures for finding such a linear combination by row-reducing an appropriate matrix (which is quite computationally efficient).

- We will also remark that there is an improvement on the quadratic sieve called the general number field sieve that operates on the same kind of principle, except instead of doing its computations with the set of rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$, it works using more general number fields such as $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}) = \{a + b\sqrt{2} : a, b \in \mathbb{Q}\}$. (Again, the details are too technical for us to treat properly here.)

- For sufficiently large integers, the sieving algorithms run far faster than methods like Pollard's ρ-algorithm.
  - Specifically, the computational complexity for the general number field sieve to factor n is approximately $e^{1.95(\ln n)^{1/3}(\ln \ln n)^{2/3}}$, while the complexity for the quadratic sieve is approximately $e^{(\ln n)^{1/2}(\ln \ln n)^{1/2}}$.
  - As a comparison, Pollard's ρ-algorithm is expected to run in roughly $n^{1/4} = e^{0.25(\ln n)^1}$ steps.
  - For small n, the exponent $0.25(\ln n)^1$ will be less than $(\ln n)^{1/2}(\ln \ln n)^{1/2}$ because of the constant 0.25, but for large n, the expression with the smaller power of $\ln n$ will be smaller.
  - Similarly, for medium-sized n, $1.95(\ln n)^{1/3}(\ln \ln n)^{2/3}$ will be bigger than $(\ln n)^{1/2}(\ln \ln n)^{1/2}$ because of the constant 1.95, but for large n, $1.95(\ln n)^{1/3}(\ln \ln n)^{2/3}$ is smaller.
  - Thus, for small integers (roughly 40 base-10 digits or fewer), Pollard's ρ-algorithm will be fastest, while for integers up to about 90 digits the quadratic sieve is best. For larger integers, the general number field sieve is the best.
  - We also remark that running Shor's algorithm on a quantum computer can factor an integer in approximately $(\ln n)^2(\ln \ln n)(\ln \ln \ln n)$ steps, vastly faster than the other algorithms we have mentioned.

Well, you're at the end of my handout. Hope it was helpful.
Copyright notice: This material is copyright Evan Dummit, 2014-2022. You may not reproduce or distribute this material without my express permission.