

---

**TD 8 – Digital signatures**


---

**Exercise 1.***Complexity analysis of the extended Euclidean Algorithm*

The goal of the exercise is to analyze the complexity of the extended Euclidean Algorithm, reminded below.

*Input:*  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, a > b$

*Output:*  $g, u, v$  such that  $g = \gcd(a, b) = au + bv$

```

1  $(r_0, u_0, v_0) \leftarrow (a, 1, 0)$ 
2  $(r_1, u_1, v_1) \leftarrow (b, 0, 1)$ 
3  $i \leftarrow 2$ 
4 While  $r_{i-1} \neq 0$ :
5    $(q_i, r_i) \leftarrow \text{QUOREM}(r_{i-2}, r_{i-1})$ 
6    $(u_i, v_i) \leftarrow (u_{i-2} - q_i u_{i-1}, v_{i-2} - q_i v_{i-1})$ 
7    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
8 Return  $(r_{i-2}, u_{i-2}, v_{i-2})$ 

```

1. The first goal is to bound the number of iterations of the while loop. For two integers  $a$  and  $b$ , we define  $s(a, b) = a + \frac{1}{\varphi}b$  where  $\varphi = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{5})$ , so that  $\varphi^2 = \varphi + 1$ .
  - i. Let  $a \geq b \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $(q, r) = \text{QUOREM}(a, b)$ . Prove that  $s(b, r) \leq \frac{1}{\varphi}s(a, b)$ . Prove and use that  $\varphi - 1 = \frac{1}{\varphi}$ .
  - ii. Deduce that the number of iterations of the while loop is  $O(\log a)$ .
2. We now bound the growth of the  $u_i$ 's and  $v_i$ 's.
  - i. Prove that for all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $r_i v_{i+1} - r_{i+1} v_i = (-1)^i a$  and  $r_i u_{i+1} - r_{i+1} u_i = (-1)^{i+1} b$ .
  - ii. Prove that for all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $u_{2i} \geq 0 \geq u_{2i+1}$  and  $v_{2i} \leq 0 \leq v_{2i+1}$ .
  - iii. Deduce that for  $i \geq 1$ ,  $|u_i| \leq b/r_{i-1}$  and  $|v_i| \leq a/r_{i-1}$ .
3. Finally we bound the bit complexity of the algorithm. For, we remind that the product and Euclidean division of two integers  $a$  and  $b$  can be computed in time  $O(\ell_a \ell_b)$  and  $O((\ell_a - \ell_b + 1)\ell_b)$  respectively where  $\ell_a = \log a$  and  $\ell_b = \log b$ .<sup>1</sup> For  $i \geq 0$ , let  $\ell_i = \log(r_i)$ .
  - i. Prove that line 5 has cost  $O((\ell_{i-2} - \ell_{i-1} + 1)\ell_1)$ .
  - ii. Prove that line 6 has cost  $O((\ell_{i-2} - \ell_{i-1})(\ell_0 - \ell_{i-2}))$ .
  - iii. Conclude that the bit complexity of the algorithm is  $O(\log(a) \log(b))$ .

**Exercise 2.***DSA*

The *Digital Signature Algorithm* (DSA) is a standardized signature scheme based on the discrete logarithm problem. It uses an identification protocol, which is transformed into a signature scheme (though not through Fiat-Shamir transform). In the exercise,  $p$  is a prime number and  $G$  is a (cyclic) subgroup of  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$  of prime order  $q$  with generator  $g$ . We define a pair keys  $sk = x \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$  and  $pk = h = g^x$ .

1. The identification protocol works as follows: The prover chooses  $k \leftarrow \{1, \dots, q-1\}$  and sends  $\ell \leftarrow g^k$ ; The verifier chooses  $\alpha, r \leftarrow \{0, \dots, q-1\}$  and sends them; The prover computes  $s = k^{-1} \cdot (\alpha + xr) \bmod q$ ; The verifier accepts iff  $s \neq 0$  and  $g^{\alpha s^{-1}} \cdot h^{r s^{-1}} = \ell$  (where  $s^{-1}$  is the inverse of  $s$  modulo  $q$ ).
  - i. Prove that if  $s \neq 0$ , the protocol is correct.
  - ii. Compute the probability that  $s = 0$ .
2. To define the DSA signature scheme, we consider a hash function  $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ . To sign with the private key  $x$ , the signer simulates the identification protocol, replacing the random choices of  $\alpha$  and  $r$  by  $\alpha \leftarrow H(m)$  and  $r \leftarrow \ell \bmod q$ . If  $s = 0$ , the signer restarts with a new value  $k$ .
  - i. Write the algorithm Sign formally. *What should be the output?*
  - ii. Describe the verification algorithm Vrfy and prove that it is correct.
  - iii. We define a variant of DSA where the message space is  $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$ , and where  $H$  is simply omitted. Show that this variant is insecure, that is one can forge a signature without knowing the private key. Is this an existential or a universal forgery?

---

<sup>1</sup>The fastest algorithms have running time approximately  $O(\ell_a \log \ell_b)$  for both problems.