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#### Abstract

We give a new post-quantum public key cryptosystem from the multiple modular subset product with errors problem.


## 1. Introduction

In [Li22e] we proposed a new post-quantum key exchange. In this paper we give a new post-quantum public key cryptosystem (PKC).

## 2. HARD PROBLEM

Our PKC is based on the multiple modular subset product with errors problem (M-MSPE) defined in [Li22e] with the change that the error prime in each MSPE instance is sampled from either the first half or the second half of the error set $L$ depending on whether the message bit is 0 or 1 . We repeat the settings in [Li22e] with this change.

## Setup

Let $\ell_{1}, \ldots, \ell_{2^{n}}$ be the first $2^{n}$ primes $^{1}$; and $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n}$ be the next $n$ primes. Denote $L=$ $\left\{\ell_{1}, \ldots, \ell_{2^{n}}\right\}$ and $P=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n}\right\} .{ }^{2}$

Choose a safe/Mersenne prime $q$ in $\left[\ell_{2^{n}}^{2 n+1}, p_{1}^{n^{2} / 8}\right]$ (e.g., the smallest safe/Mersenne prime greater than $\left.\ell_{2^{n}}^{2 n+1}\right){ }^{3}$

Let $D_{a}$ be the distribution that samples a vector $v=\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{n}$ uniformly at random and outputs the integer $a:=\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}^{v_{i}}$.

Let $D_{e}$ be the distribution that keeps sampling vectors $v=\left(v_{0}, \ldots, v_{n-1}\right) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{\left\lceil\log \left(\ell_{2} n\right)\right\rceil}$ until finding one such that the integer $e:=\sum_{i=0}^{\left\lceil\log \left(\ell_{2^{n}}\right)\right\rceil-1}\left(v_{i} \cdot 2^{i}\right)$ is a prime in $L$ (i.e. a prime $\leq \ell_{2^{n}}$ ) and outputs $e$.

Let $D_{e}(b)$ be the distribution that takes as input a bit $b \in\{0,1\}$ and keeps sampling vectors $v=\left(v_{0}, \ldots, v_{n-2}\right) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{\left\lceil\log \left(\ell_{2} n\right)\right\rceil}$ until finding one such that the integer $e:=b \cdot 2^{\left\lceil\log \left(\ell_{2^{n}}\right)\right\rceil-1}+$ $\sum_{i=0}^{\left\lceil\log \left(\ell_{2} n\right)\right\rceil-2}\left(v_{i} \cdot 2^{i}\right)$ is a prime in $L$ and outputs $e$.

Let $D_{e}^{n}(v)$ be the distribution that takes as input a vector $v=\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right) \in\{0,1\}^{n}$, samples a vector of primes $e=\left(e_{1}, \ldots, e_{n}\right) \in L$ with $e_{i} \leftarrow D_{e}\left(v_{i}\right)$ for $i \in[n]$, and outputs $e$. ${ }^{4}$

This is the $6^{\text {th }}$ paper of the series. Previously: [Li22a; Li22b; Li22c; Li22d; Li22e].
Date: October 6, 2022.
Email: treyquantum@gmail.com
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Let $D_{x}(b)$ with respect to some $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in\{0,1\}^{n}$ be the distribution that takes as input a bit $b \in\{0,1\}$, samples $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \leftarrow D_{a}$ and $e \leftarrow D_{e}(b)$, computes $X=\prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{i}^{x_{i}} \cdot e^{ \pm 1}$ $(\bmod q)$, and outputs $\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X\right)$, where the exponent $\pm 1$ of $e$ is arbitrary.

Let $O_{x}$ with respect to some $x \in\{0,1\}^{n}$ be the oracle that outputs instances ( $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X$ ) sampled from $D_{x}(b)$, where $b \in\{0,1\}$ is arbitrary for each instance.

## Problems

Search M-MSPE (or M-MSPE) is given access to $O_{x}$, find $x$.
Decision M-MSPE is given access to either $O_{x}$ for some $x \in\{0,1\}^{n}$, or $O_{\text {ran }}$ which outputs MSPE instances $\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X\right)$ with $X=\prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{i}^{x_{i}} \cdot e^{ \pm 1}(\bmod q)$ replaced by $X \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_{q}^{\times}$, decide which is the oracle given.

## Hardness

To inherit hardness from the original M-MSPE in [Li22e], one thing to notice is that the hardness of the problem does not seem to be effected by tuning the forms of the error terms, including changing the exponents of the error primes in an error term, changing the number of error primes in an error term, or even changing the distribution of the error primes as long as the entropy of the distribution is sufficiently high so that one cannot brute force it. This gives us opportunity to store information in the error terms. In particular, we go with the third way for our PKC, i.e., we use error primes that belong to the first or second half of $L$ to represent 0 or 1 . One could also use one or two error primes for an error term to represent 0 or 1 . But that requires a larger modulus $q$ which reduces the efficiency of the PKC.

## 3. IDEA

The goal of PKC is to encrypt a plaintext into a cyphertext using a public key such that only having the corresponding private key one can recover the plaintext from the ciphertext.

Our PKC idea is illustrated by the following figure.

The public key is an M-MSPE $(M, A)$, where $M=\left\{a_{i, j}\right\}_{i, j \in[n]} \leftarrow D_{a}^{n \times n}$ is the base matrix, and $A=\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{Z}_{q}^{\times}\right)^{n}$ is the M-MSPE product sequence. The private key is the corresponding secret $(x, e) \in\{0,1\}^{n} \times L^{n}$.

To encode an $n$-bit message $m \in\{0,1\}^{n}$, we sample a random vector $y=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{n}$ and compute an M-MSPE product sequence $B=\left(B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}\right)$ with the error term $f_{i}$ of $B_{i}$ sampled from $D_{e}\left(m_{i}\right)$. Compute a composite MSPE $C=A_{1}^{y_{1}} \cdots A_{n}^{y_{n}} \cdot f_{n+1}(\bmod q)$. The output is $c=(B, C)$.

To decode, use $x$ to compute a composite product $D=B_{1}^{x_{1}} \cdots B_{n}^{x_{n}}(\bmod q)$. Then compute $E=C / D(\bmod q)$, which contains only error primes. Then use the private errors $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{n}$ to recover $y$ by testing if $e_{i} \mid E$. Then recover the error terms $f_{i}$ which tell the plaintext $m$.

## 4. SCHEME

Public parameters are ( $n, q, L$ ), where $L$ is represented by the $2^{n}$-th prime $\ell_{2^{n}}$. Plaintext is $m \in\{0,1\}^{n}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { KeyGen }(n, q, L) \text { : } \\
& \quad \text { Sample a base matrix } M=\left\{a_{i, j}\right\}_{i, j \in[n]} \leftarrow D_{a_{n}}^{n \times n} \text {. Sample }(x, e) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{n} \times D_{e}^{n} \text {. Com- } \\
& \text { pute } A=\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right) \text {, where } A_{i}=a_{i, 1}^{x_{1}} \cdots a_{i, n}^{x_{n}} \cdot e_{i}(\bmod q) \text { for } i \in[n] \text {. Public key is } \\
& \quad \text { pk }:=(M, A) ; \text { private key is } s k:=(x, e) \text {. } \\
& \text { Encrypt }(n, q, L, p k, m) \text { : } \\
& \quad \text { Sample }(y, f) \leftarrow\{0,1\}^{n} \times D_{e}^{n}(m) \text {. Compute } B=\left(B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}\right) \text {, where } B_{i}=a_{1, i}^{y_{1}} \cdots a_{n, i}^{y_{n}} \text {. } \\
& \quad 1 / f_{i}(\bmod q) \text { for } i \in[n] \text {. Sample } f_{n+1} \leftarrow D_{e} \text {. Compute } C=A_{1}^{y_{1}} \cdots A_{n}^{y_{n}} \cdot f_{n+1}(\bmod q) \text {. } \\
& \quad \text { Output cyphertext } c=(B, C) \text {. } \\
& \text { Decrypt }(n, q, M, x, e, c) \text { : } \\
& \quad \operatorname{Compute} D=B_{1}^{x_{1}} \cdots B_{n}^{x_{n}}(\bmod q) \text {. Compute } E=C / D(\bmod q) \text {. Compute } y^{\prime} \in \\
& \{0,1\}^{n} \text { such that } y_{i}^{\prime}=1 \text { if and only if } e_{i} \mid E \text {, for } i \in[n] . \operatorname{Compute} f_{i}^{\prime}=a_{1, i}^{y_{1}^{\prime}} \cdots a_{n, i}^{y_{n}^{\prime}} / B_{i} \\
& \quad(\bmod q) \text { and set } m_{i}^{\prime}=\operatorname{MSB}\left(f_{i}^{\prime}\right)^{5}, \text { for } i \in[n] \text {. Output } m^{\prime}=\left(m_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, m_{n}^{\prime}\right) \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## 5. Correctness

Theorem 1. $m^{\prime}=m$ with overwhelming probability.
Proof. Note that $L$ is exponentially large and there are $4 n+2$ (i.e. linearly many) error primes (they are the $e_{i}$ 's and $f_{i}$ 's in the scheme) sampled either from (roughly) the first half of $L$ or the second half of $L$. Hence the error primes are all different with overwhelming probability $p$.

Again recall that $q$ is greater than the product of any $2 n+1$ primes in $L$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
E & =\left(e_{1}^{y_{1} \cdots e_{n}^{y_{n}}}\right) \cdot\left(f_{1}^{\left.x_{1} \cdots f_{n}^{x_{n}}\right) \cdot f_{n+1}(\bmod q)}\right. \\
& =\left(e_{1}^{y_{1}} \cdots e_{n}^{y_{n}}\right) \cdot\left(f_{1}^{\left.x_{1} \cdots f_{n}^{x_{n}}\right) \cdot f_{n+1} .}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose all error primes in the scheme are different. Then $y_{i}=1$ if and only if $e_{i} \mid E$. Then $y^{\prime}=y$ and thus $f_{i}^{\prime}=f_{i}$ for all $i \in[n]$. Then $m^{\prime}=m$. Therefore $m^{\prime}=m$ with overwhelming probability $p$.

## 6. Efficiency

Due to the underlining operation being multiplication instead of addition, the modulus $q$ and thus the size of the encoding is inevitably large. However the time complexity is actually not very high due to the logarithmic complexity of modular multiplication.
THEOREM 2. The time complexities of key generation, encryption and decryption are $O\left(n^{5}\right)$, $O\left(n^{4}\right)$ and $O\left(n^{3}\right)$ respectively.

Proof. The complexities mainly come from modular multiplications. Note that $q \gtrsim \ell_{2^{n}}^{2 n+1} \gtrsim$ $\left(n 2^{n}\right)^{2 n+1}=2^{O\left(n^{2}\right)}$. Hence the complexity of a single modular multiplication is $O\left(\log _{2} q\right)=$ $O\left(n^{2}\right)$. There are $O\left(n^{3}\right)$ modular multiplications in key generation $\left(O\left(n^{3}\right)\right.$ to create the base

[^0]matrix $M$ and $O\left(n^{2}\right)$ to compute the M-MSPE product sequence $A$ ), $O\left(n^{2}\right)$ modular multiplications in encryption, and $O(n)$ modular multiplications in decryption. Hence the time complexities of the three algorithms are $O\left(n^{5}\right), O\left(n^{4}\right)$ and $O\left(n^{3}\right)$.

## 7. SECURITY

The differences between the problem that we use to construct our PKC and the M-MSPE in Section 2 are: (1) instead of giving unlimited access to the oracle $O_{x}$, the PKC only gives $n+1$ MSPE instances; (2) one of the instances is a special one whose bases $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}$ are themselves MSPE products rather than regular bases sampled from $D_{a}$; and (3) the base matrix ( $M, A$ ) (i.e. the public key) is reused in different implementations of encryption. We denote this M-MSPE as M-MSPE $P_{P K C}$.

Decision M-MSPE $P_{P K C}$ is defined similar to Decision M-MSPE in Section 2 with the above changes from M-MSPE to $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MSPE}}^{P K C}$; and it asks to distinguish the $\mathrm{MSPE}_{P K C}$ product sequence ( $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n+1}$ ) from uniform, with the bases ( $M, A$ ) fixed.

Assume the hardness of Decision MSPE $_{P K C}$, we prove that our PKC is semantically secure against chosen plaintext attack. The key point of the following theorem is the hardness of Decision M-MSPE $P_{P K C}$ with an arbitrary vector $v \in\{0,1\}^{n}$ in $D_{e}^{n}(v)$, where the vector $v$ in the problem is actually the message $m$ in the PKC. In other words, letting the error primes in each MSPE instance be chosen freely from the first half of $L$ or the second half of $L$ does make the resulting product sequence of the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{MSPE}_{P K C}$ less random.

THEOREM 3. If Decision $\mathrm{M}_{-\mathrm{MSPE}_{P K C}}$ is hard, then the PKC is semantically secure against chosen plaintext attack.

Proof. Let ( $B, C$ ) and ( $B^{\prime}, C^{\prime}$ ) be two ciphertexts of two messages $m$ and $m^{\prime}$ respectively. Let $d_{1}$ be the distinguishable distance between $(B, C)$ and uniform; $d_{2}$ be the distinguishable distance between ( $B^{\prime}, C^{\prime}$ ) and uniform; and $d_{3}$ be the distinguishable distance between ( $B, C$ ) and $\left(B^{\prime}, C^{\prime}\right)$. Now suppose for contradiction that there is a probabilistic polynomial time adversary $\mathcal{A}$ who is given the public key $(M, A)$ and distinguishes $(B, C)$ and $\left(B^{\prime}, C^{\prime}\right)$ with noticeable probability. Then $d_{3}$ is noticeable. By the triangle inequality we have that $d_{1}+$ $d_{2}>d_{3}$. Hence $d_{1}+d_{2}$ is noticeable. This means that at least one of $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$ is noticeable. This contradicts the hardness of Decision M-MSPE $P_{P K C}$, which says that both $(B, C)$ and ( $B^{\prime}, C^{\prime}$ ) are indistinguishable from uniform for any vectors $m$ and $m^{\prime}$.
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